

**THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS**

LIBRARY

From the collection of
James Collins,
Drumcondra, Ireland.
Purchased, 1918.

941.5
Or6b

Return this book on or before the
Latest Date stamped below. A
charge is made on all overdue
books.

U. of I. Library

NOV 31
DEC - 3 '66

NOV - 5 '71

DEC 4 1974
NOV 25 1974

9324-S



THE BATTLE
OF
THE FAITH IN IRELAND.

BY
CANON O'ROURKE, P.P., M.R.I.A.,

Author of

"THE HISTORY OF THE GREAT IRISH FAMINE OF 1847,"

"THE CENTENARY LIFE OF O'CONNELL," ETC.

"Take resolutely to the study of Irish History."

RT. HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

Dublin:
JAMES DUFFY AND SONS,
14 AND 15 WELLINGTON QUAY.
1887.

DUBLIN :

Printed by Edmund Burke and Co.,
61 & 62 GREAT STRAND STREET.

P R E F A C E.

THE title of this volume may be taken as an epitome of its contents.

The Battle of the Faith in Ireland has been long and varied. It extends from the day the apostate friar, George Browne, was intruded into the See of Dublin, until the Catholics had grown so numerous, that it was no longer safe to keep them in bondage ; for it is only within the last few years that any English statesman even pretended to make them concessions from motives of justice. They ought to be grateful, and no doubt are very grateful, that within the present generation, England's greatest orator and statesman has laboured heart and soul to make atonement for their past wrongs, by wise and enlightened legislation.

In projecting this work, the Author did not intend it to be anything approaching a complete history of Ireland for the period it treats of. His object was to cull from the materials before him such historical facts as, on the one hand, would serve to show the wily astuteness and unflagging energy with which the enemies of the Catholic Faith carried on their work, and on the other, the continuous battle that was waged against them—a battle sometimes well planned and successful—often desultory, ill directed, and ending in disaster, but never abandoned. So that during this lengthened period, Ireland might be correctly described by the short expressive motto of the

O'Gradys—VULNERATUS NON VICTUS—often defeated but still unsubdued.

As the Author proceeded with his work, he sometimes found it difficult to settle how much of the general history ought to be introduced. As a rule he elected to admit as much of it as the nature of his plan would permit, both for information sake, and to add interest to his narrative. The great leading events have been fully and carefully dealt with, such as the Plantation of Munster and Ulster, the war of 1641, the battles of Benburb and Rathmines, Cromwell's career in Ireland, the two sieges of Limerick, &c. These were real battles in the military sense, but there were others of a different kind, fought more persistently and with quite as much danger to Catholic Faith, namely, the battles of Legislation, of Education, and of Proselytism : to these the Author has devoted as much space as he had at his command. The trial was long and severe, but the children of God's Church in Ireland have come out of the fiery furnace, unscathed and triumphant.

The Author begs to tender his grateful thanks to the gentlemen who kindly put this volume through the Press, when he, on account of illness, was unable to give it his attention.

ST. MARY'S, MAYNOOTH,
1st December, 1886.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	Page.
Introduction—First perverts, Earl of Ossory and Lord Butler—Their immediate promotion—Henry VIII. appoints George Browne Archbishop of Dublin on the death of Archbishop Allen—Staples of Meath (note)—The flag of Ireland the flag of Catholicity—George Browne's episcopate a failure—His opinion of the Irish people—Staples—Lord Deputy, Leonard Gray—Browne's complaints to Thomas Cromwell—The King's contempt for him—His slavish meanness—The Act permitting the clergy to marry—Its spirit and tenor—Eulogium on celibacy—Primate Dowdall—Mary becomes queen—Her government in Ireland—Protestant historians on Mary's restoration of Catholicity—Henry's bishops deprived—Lord Deputy Sussex (note)—Henry's first scruples about his marriage with Catherine (note)—Elizabeth's accession—Persecuting laws—The Irish Parliament of 1558—Its constitution—Its terrible enactments—"Plantation of Munster"—The Earl of Desmond—Frivolous charges brought against him—He is confined in the Tower of London—Anecdote of him (note)—Lord Deputy Sydney—His high-minded conduct in regard to Desmond—Desmond's vast possessions coveted for an English Plantation—Younger sons of English gentlemen to be undertakers—Irish not to be employed in any capacity—The Plantation not a success—Position of priests—Sydney's dispatch from Munster to England—Connaught in Elizabeth's time—Catholics of the Pale—The Geraldines—Fitton—Bingham,	1

CHAPTER II.

Catholicity in Ulster—Elizabeth's want of power there—Froude and Hugh O'Neill—Froude's misrepresentation—Camden's account—Elizabeth's great kindness to O'Neill according to Mr. Froude—Falsehood about Hugh O'Neill having been brought up a Protestant at the Court of Elizabeth—His first recorded visit to England was in 1567—His probable age then—About twenty-seven years—Carew MSS.—Captain Lee's brief declaration—O'Neill's conduct when with the Lord Deputy—Captain Lee's hopes of his conversion—His influence over the Ulster Catholics unimpaired—The young Earl of Desmond's reception in Munster—Miler Magrath (note)—Formidable opposition to Elizabeth at this time—Price, a spy on young Desmond—Great pains taken to make his coming known—The people's conduct towards him at Cork—His reception at Kilmallock—Immense crowds there—Their indignation at finding he was a Protestant—They hurry away faster than they came—Application of their action to the case of O'Neill—The young Earl of Desmond returned to England and soon died,	14
---	----

CHAPTER III.

	Page.
The Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy tendered as <i>one oath</i> —This system produced some two hundred martyrs—the vast majority of whom were priests—Also very many confessors—Many heroic laymen also suffered—Among the martyrs there were fourteen bishops—Examples of the punishments inflicted—Forty-two priests drowned—Bishop O'Haly and Father O'Rourke seized on landing—Brought before Drury, Lord Deputy—Declared boldly their calling and mission—They were racked, their bones being broken with hammers, and needles thrust under their nails—They were hanged upon a tree, where their bodies remained 14 days as targets for the bullet practice of the soldiers—Bishop's warning to Drury—He dies in a few days at Waterford in great agony—Countess of Desmond—She was a Butler, being daughter of Lord Dunboyne—Lord Deputy Gray—Slaughter at Smerwick, Nov., 1580—Martyrdom of Father Moore, Oliver Plunket, and William Walsh—Their sufferings—Their profession of faith—Martyrdom of Father Daniel O'Nielan at Youghal—Martyrdom of Most Rev. Dr. O'Hurly, Archbishop of Cashel—His arrival in Ireland—Goes to Slane Castle—Chief-Justice Dillon interviews him—The Archbishop flies from Slane Castle—Fleming, Baron of Slane, brought before the Council in Dublin—being "tepid in faith," he revealed what he knew of the Archbishop, who was arrested in Carrick-on-Suir and brought back to Dublin, where he was subjected to the most fiendish torments—He is despatched by the Lords-Justices lest his punishment should be mitigated—Relaxation of persecution—Lord Bacon—Mountjoy—The princely policy—Martyrdom of O'Rourke, Prince of Breffnie—Villainy of James I.—O'Rourke's profession of faith—His desire to be hanged with a gad in the Irish fashion,	24

CHAPTER IV.

James I.—Expectations of clemency from him disappointed—Catholics too importunate—Penalties for not attending Protestant worship increased—Church-Papists—Protestant Bishop of Cork, &c., on Lord Barry's conduct—Ever "Massing" every where—Horsfall of Ossory—Justice Saxey—Brouncker banishes priests illegally—Rewards offered for seizing them—The king's proclamation banishing priests—Zeal of the priests according to Sir J. Davys—The Flight of the Earls did not make the Catholics despair—Priests return from abroad—Devotion of Irishwomen to the faith—Fines for absence from Protestant service—The Star Chamber (note)—Appeal against the King's Proclamation—Chichester's knavery—New clause added to proclamation—The Dublin Corporation summoned to attend service in Christ's Church—Heavy fines for not attending—Try to save their property—Prevented by the Star Chamber—Petition from the Catholics—Brouncker's intemperate zeal checked by the Council—The fines for not appearing at Protestant service actively enforced in Connaught,	33
--	----

CHAPTER V.

	Page
Plantation of Ulster—The dispossessed natives compelled to inhabit certain barren districts—Soldiers planted amongst them to overawe them and observe their movements—Scandalous robbery of the natives—The woodkern—The escheated lands over 3,000,000 acres—Derry given to twelve London companies—Fraudulent surveys—Trinity College—Wentworth fines the London companies—The views of James and Chichester on Popery in Ireland—The Parliament of 1613—Irish peers' address to the king—Heads of bills—Creation of forty new boroughs to swamp the constituencies—Immense grants to Chichester—Contention about the Speakership—"Letter of divers Lords of the Pale"—House packed by government officials—Deputation to England—Lord Deputy sends officials beforehand to the king—The Catholics set a subscription on foot to defray the expenses of their deputation, which Chichester suppressed by proclamation—His misrepresentations to the king—Substance of Chichester's proclamation—The king's conduct towards the deputation—King sends commissioners to Ireland—A sham commission, the Lord Deputy, who was most inculpated, having been put on it with four others—A report was of course drawn up, which the king having "well perused and considered," denounced the Catholic Deputation in a proclamation—Chichester created a Baron with a grant of the whole of Innishowen, O'Doherty's country—The king at length gives an answer to the Catholic Deputation; its purport (note)—Chichester recalled—Sir Oliver St. John sent in his place—His government—A continuous persecution of the Catholics—Ruined by continual fines—St. John recalled and made a Viscount—Falkland sent over—Ussher's sermon at his installation—Proclamation ordering all priests to quit the country in 40 days—James's plan to plant Leinster and Connaught as he had done Ulster—Artful warrant to Chichester—Leland's view—Sham investigation—Real reason for seizing land—Forfeitures in Connaught—Barefaced robbery of the people,	41

CHAPTER VI.

Irish Court of Wards established by James I. in 1617—Unconstitutionally, too, for he called it into existence without the consent of Parliament—Its rules and provisions—Constructed to rob the Catholics both of their property and their faith—Persons to whom Wards were assigned (note)—Number of minors disposed of in eight years—Many of them the most important Catholic heirs in the Kingdom—Elizabeth had a similar but less perfect system—George 16th Earl of Kildare, first Protestant Geraldine in Leinster—Two previous members of the family assumed to be Protestants—The eleventh Earl—His appointments under Elizabeth—His will—His trial—Sometimes spoke with suspicious contempt of Papists—Viscount Baltinglass's letter to the Earl—The Catholic fugitive Geraldine—Educated by Cardinal Pole—Master of Horse to Cosmo, Duke of Florence—Comes to England, and marries the Lady Mabel Browne—His Career—

His sons Henry and William—Gerald 14th Earl—His mother an Englishwoman—Fond of putting himself forward as an Englishman to Cecil and the Queen—A perpetual suitor for gifts and preferments—Generally regarded as a Protestant—Curious facts which throw a doubt on this—Grants to him by James I.—Dr. Knox, Bishop of Raphoe—Sent to tear Catholicity up by the roots—Kildare's speech to the Viceroy—Kildare takes ill at Dublin Castle, believes himself poisoned, rides hurriedly home to Maynooth, sends for a priest, and is dead before morning—O'Daly's account—Chichester's letter to Salisbury—Wardship of Kildare's son—The enchanted Earl—The fairy Earl—Character of the 16th Earl—Viscount Thurles—His age when made a Ward—King James's shameless injustice about the Ormonde property (note)—Death of James—Amount of his confiscations—The Ranelaghs (note), . . . 57

CHAPTER VII.

Charles, the third and only surviving son of James I., becomes King—The Irish Catholics unmolested in the beginning of his reign—War with Spain—Lord Deputy Falkland appealed to Irish landowners for funds for the war—They promised to raise what he called for—Two-thirds of the landowners who met the Viceroy were Catholics, and the cry was raised they were going to buy toleration—The Protestant bishops met and drew up what they termed the "Judgment of divers of the Archbishops, &c."—Contents of the document—£120,000 were raised, for which Charles granted fifty-one "Graces," as those concessions were called—The "Graces" did not apply exclusively to the Catholics, the majority of them applied to Protestants as well as Catholics—Ussher's religious liberty—Buying and selling Church Livings—Falkland ordered to summon a Parliament—Suspicious mistake, Parliament not legally convened—Leland's view—Proclamation against priests—Catholics pay nine-tenths of the subsidies—Persecuting outrage in Cook St., Dublin—Imprisonment of eight Catholic aldermen—15 Catholic churches and a Catholic college seized—The King approves of it all—The English Privy Council to the Irish Privy Council—Elizabeth's law against saying Mass—Catholics aroused to a sense of their position—Wentworth sent to Ireland—The fine of 12d. a Sunday on Catholics for being absent from Protestant service despised by Wentworth—A mere trifle to him—He had higher aims, and was determined to complete the confiscation of the soil of Ireland—Wentworth summons a Parliament—The Catholic element still predominant—His plan for ruling the Parliament—He put as many dependants of the Crown into Parliament as he could—Wentworth the subservient tool of the King—Meanness and falsehood of both—Wentworth deceives the Parliament—Turns his attention to the planting of Connaught—Ormonde gives his property up to the King—Others do the same—Wentworth goes to Connaught with an imposing retinue—The whole of that Province to be confiscated and planted—Leland—The Connaught proprietors not so facile as Ormonde—Wentworth's speech at Boyle—Lawyers were heard on both sides—King's

title found at Boyle—Sligo and Mayo followed the example—
The Galway Grand Jury was not so pliant—They were nearly
all Catholics—Besides they hoped for support from the House
of Clanrickard—They refused to find for the King—Went-
worth became furious, and determined to ruin them, which he
was not slow to do—Not only the jurors but the whole county
was punished—Judges openly bribed, 74

CHAPTER VIII.

A Retrospect of one hundred years, 91

CHAPTER IX.

The causes which led to the War of 1641—Misstatements of Pro-
testant historians—Temple—Clarendon—Carte—Warner—Pro-
clamation against priests—Chichester's villainy—Approved of
by James—Toleration!—The Protestant Bishop of Raphoe—
Articles sent to Chichester—James Hamilton—Bishop Knox
again (note)—Report of Commissioners on religion—Sir Oliver
St. John succeeds Chichester as Lord Deputy—Citation and
punishment of Lord Inchiquin by Lords-Justices—Anderson
the priest hunter—Proclamation for bishops, priests, &c., to
depart from Ireland within forty days—Another report con-
cerning the state of the Church in Ireland—The English
invasion—Warner's opinion—Roman colonization—English
ditto in Ireland—Irish motives for resistance—"Faith and
Fatherland"—Sir Phelim O'Neill—Remonstrance of the Catho-
lics at Trim—Intolerance of the Puritans—Dr. Anderson's
opinion—Proclamation against Recusants—The Covenanters
(note)—Catholics influenced by the success of the Puritans—
Archbishop Laud—Fearful blasphemy (note)—Leslie takes the
field against the King—Enthusiastic conscription throughout
Scotland—The Scots cross the border and plunder the two
northern counties of England—Charles was obliged to treat
with the Scotch rebels at Ripon—The Irish miscalculate their
resources—The Rising of 1641—Restrictions on education—
Irish students abroad, 96

CHAPTER X.

Roger O'Moore—Young O'Neill—Sir Richard Plunket—Lord
Maguire—Hugh Oge M'Mahon—Philip O'Reilly—Torlogh
O'Neill—First meeting at Roger O'Moore's lodgings—Hopes
and plans—Arrival of Neill O'Neill—Cardinal Richelieu—Death
of Don John O'Neill—23rd Oct., fixed on for the Rising of the
Catholics—Resolution to surprise Dublin Castle—Defections—
Wonderful secrecy—Owen O'Connolly—The British Officer
on O'Connolly—Fosterage (note)—Lord Maguire and O'Con-
nolly in Dublin—O'Connolly goes to the Lord Justice Parsons
and turns informer—Great reward to O'Connolly—His end, . . . 108

CHAPTER XI.

Earlier events of the War—Island Magee—Shooting of Sir Toby
Caulfield—Sir Phelim O'Neill's reverses—Landing of Owen

	Page.
Roe O'Neill—Conduct of the Lords-Justices—The accession of the Palesmen to the Rising—The Rising in Munster and Connaught—Parsons and Borlase—The English Pale—Grievances laid before the King—Fraudulent adjournment of Parliament—Palesmen wait on the Lords-Justices—Their treatment by them—Parliament meets in November—Castlehaven at Maddinstown—Sir Charles Coote—Julianstown—Interview between Palesmen and Native Irish—Temple's falsehood about Julianstown—Ormonde's expedition to Naas—Father Higgins—Ormonde's expedition northwards—Offered submission by some Palesmen, but did not accept it—Misrepresentation of this in England—Imprisonment of Lord Dunsany—Persons put to the rack—Rising of Munster—St. Leger—His cruelties—Request of the Munster gentlemen—St. Leger calls them "rebels"—Taking of Cashel—Good treatment of English there by the victorious Irish—Lord Mountgarret—Lords-Justices despise or pretend to despise the defection of the Pale—Connaught—Clanrickard's terms with Galway not ratified—Willoughby—No submissions to be received, . . .	115

CHAPTER XII.

Synod of Kells—Dease of Meath—Congregation at Kilkenny—General Assembly—Oath of Association—Supreme Council—Seal of the Confederation—Generals appointed for the four Provinces—The King's difficulties with the Parliamentarians—Sets up his standard at Nottingham—Preston's successes—Owen Roe O'Neill—His correspondence with Leslie—Operations in Munster—Note on Leslie—Note on Inchiquin—Inchiquin's soldiers sicken of fresh meat—Lieut.-Gen. Bourke—Fort of Galway—Bourke, Bishop of Clonfert—Confederation agents abroad—Grievances of the army—King's cause in England—Battle of Edge Hill—Goodwin and Reynolds—Beginning of Cessation—Commissioners from Confederation—Sharp reply from Supreme Council—Phrase "Odious Rebellion"—Supreme Council modify their first letter—Lords-Justices against Cessation—Ormonde sick—Wins the army—Goes to the Council Chamber—His progress to New Ross—His parley with the Sovereign of the town—Battle of New Ross—Lord Lisle (note)—Catholic Grievances—Cessation left to Ormonde—Activity of the Confederates at home and abroad—Straits of Inchiquin—Sir Philip Percival—Clanrickard—Herrings for the army—Clanrickard's proceedings—Motives for Cessation—State of the Catholic Army—Arrival of Scarampi—Belling's reasons for Cessation—Scarampi's reply—Cessation agreed to—Views of the Privy Council—Articles of Cessation signed at Sigginstown, . . .	161
--	-----

CHAPTER XIII.

Succours sent to Charles—Defeated at Nantwick—Supreme Council opposed to private persons raising an army for the King—Ormonde made Lord Lieutenant—The four things he was to attend to—Advantages of the Cessation to Charles—His diffi-
--

culties—The Puritans—Monroe and the Covenant—Covenant taken in spite of the King's Proclamation against it—Puritan views about it—Violations of the Cessation—Owen O'Neill observes it—English Parliament opposed to it—Dr. Leland's opinion—Owen O'Connolly's mission—Difficulties of English Colonels in Ulster—Ulster Protestants and the Covenant—Monroe and New Scots—Their slaughter of Irish peasants—Break the Cessation—Scotch army—Owen O'Neill—Monroe disregards the Cessation—O'Neill in Waterford—Castlehaven goes to Ulster—His ill success there—Fennell does not aid O'Neill—Earl of Antrim—Supreme command offered to and declined by Ormonde—Catholic agents sent to Oxford—The King writes to Ireland for Commissioners—Archbishop Ussher—Protestant (assumed) Deputation—Chief demands of the Catholics—Young Coote—Demands of the particular Protestants—The King in a dilemma—His answer to the Catholics—Matter referred to Ormonde—Most Rev. Dr. Fleming—Ormonde's Counter Claims—The Irish answer—Unlegalized toleration for Catholics—Ormonde would not declare the Covenanters rebels—He offers to resign—His powers enlarged—Wardships restricted—Personal favours to Ormonde—Custodians—Ormonde persists in calling the Catholics rebels—Captain Swanly—Lady Alice Moore—Young Lord Moore—George Stroude—The King's absurd concessions to Moore—Monroe and Ormonde—Clanrickard—Irish would not go to Scotland—The Peace—It falls through—Ormonde's demands, . 200

CHAPTER XIV.

Glamorgan's mission—Failure of Charles's plans—Ormonde—Reasons of Glamorgan's mission—Ormonde's religious declaration—Glamorgan's powers—Charles's double dealing—Glamorgan—Treaty with the Catholics—Declaration of General Assembly—Rinuccini, the Pope's Nuncio, arrives—Delivers his views—Discovery of the secret treaty—How?—Sent to the English Parliament—Charge of Treason preferred against Glamorgan by Lord Digby—He is imprisoned—Action of the Supreme Council—Fatal delays—Digby's real motive (note)—His character—The Parliament complains that Irish rebels had been brought over to England and Scotland—The King disavows Glamorgan—Sir Thomas Fairfax—Padstow—Discovery of letters at—Ormonde—Digby—Lord Muskerry—N. Plunket—Glamorgan's titles—King's letter to Ormonde—Ditto—Dr. Lingard's view—Glamorgan—Treaty agreed to at Rome—The Queen agrees to the Roman treaty, and why?—The General Assembly accepts Ormonde's peace, although opposed by the Nuncio—Its provisions and chief objects, 224

CHAPTER XV.

The Peace of forty-six—Published on 29th July—Ormonde's policy—Ormonde's power in the Supreme Council—Meeting of prelates at Waterford—Oath of Association discussed there—Commissioners' apparent neglect of instructions—Ormonde's great error—Glamorgan's mission—The peace condemned—The reasons—

Battle of Benburb—Numbers engaged—Carte's misstatements about Monroe's advance—Authorities contradicting it—Monroe's generalship at Benburb—The Nuncio calls O'Neill south—Ormonde in danger—Carte's astounding assertion—Ormonde opens negotiations with the Parliament—Dissolution of the old Supreme Council—Jealousies of generals—Battle of Dungan's hill—The attempt on Dublin—The Nuncio proceeds to Kilkea Castle—Father R. Nugent—The Countess of Kildare—The Confederate armies at Lucan and Leixlip—Clanrickard's peace—The mysterious messenger—O'Neill retires into Meath—Preston's prevarications—Ormonde moves into Westmeath and Longford to subvert his army—His agreement with the Parliament Commissioners—Addendum to concessions offered to the Catholics—Sacrifices of families—Ormonde's treatment by the Parliamentary Commissioners—He is compelled to leave Dublin Castle before the appointed time—He commissioned others to give up the regalia—Bellings' unsustained assertion about the King's order to Ormonde—Ormonde's habit of avoiding the King's orders—He tells him to make peace with the Irish at any cost—Supposed letter of Charles from Newcastle—Episcopalianism abolished in Dublin by the Parliament's Commissioners—Ormonde's treatment after arriving in England—Is obliged to go to France—Nuncio's report on the state of the kingdom—Inchiquin's butcheries at Cashel—Taaffe's inaction—Correspondence of Ormonde with Inchiquin—Taaffe at Knockaness (note)—Ormonde goes to France—His diplomatic skill—His hatred of the Catholics, and its cause—His hatred of the Nuncio and O'Neill—His mode of dealing with the Catholics—Thoughts of a foreign protectorate—Embassies sent—The Nuncio's view—Ormonde's view—Swamping of the General Assembly—The Embassy to France, how managed—Ormonde's advice to the Queen—Preston and Taaffe's instructions—The Nuncio and O'Neill—The Cessation with Inchiquin—His treatment of the Assembly—Nuncio's reasons against the truce with Inchiquin—Reply of the Supreme Council—Truce made with Inchiquin—The Nuncio privately leaves Kilkenny—He publishes an Interdict and Excommunication—Appeal against them—Taaffe and Clanrickard's expedition—The Nuncio goes to Galway—Preston marches against O'Neill—The assembling of a Synod prevented—O'Neill proclaimed a rebel—Charges against the Nuncio—He sails from Galway—His character—The spirit of the historians of 1641—Borlase—Abbizzi's letter—Removal of the censures delayed, . . . 240

CHAPTER XVI.

Ormonde returns to Ireland—Proceeds to Carrick Castle—He brings but a small sum of money to pay the troops—Pretended he brought drafts on various merchants—The army becomes discontented—Inchiquin is alarmed and sends for Ormonde—Report of Mr. Fanshaw coming with supplies—Ormonde goes to Kilkenny—Enters it in regal splendour—Is enthroned in the Castle—Declares the Confederation dissolved—Remonstrance of the English army—Its effect in Ireland—Execution of the King

—The Prince proclaimed King as Charles II. by Ormonde in such towns as owned his sway—Overtures to O'Neill—O'Neill's difficulties—Deserted by more than half his army and their commanders—Reply to Ormonde—His demands—Ormonde willing to grant them, but the Commissioners were against them, and no terms were come to—O'Neill concludes a truce with Monk—Inchiquin before Dundalk—Monk's soldiers desert him—Colonel Trevor gets bargains—Monk summoned to London, where he was censured—Junction of the Confederate army with Ormonde's—Reinforcements sent to Jones—Cromwell coming—Lord Dillon of Costello at Finglas—Rathmines taken—Baginbun—Purcell sets out to fortify it—Ormonde went early next morning to see it—Little or nothing had been done—He went back to bed—He was soon aroused—Mounts his horse to ride towards Baginbun, but meets Purcell's men flying towards him—Ormonde's men fled also—It was a rout and a slaughter—The Irish were of opinion that Ormonde had a secret understanding with the Parliament, his overthrow was so complete—Jones's feelings—The killed, wounded, and prisoners—Numbers engaged—Purcell and his party—The Irish blamed—No cause for it—Purcell's negligence—Carte and Cox—The English officer—State of Ormonde's camp—O'Neill's opinion of Ormonde's army—Ormonde at Ballysodan—Ormonde's lies—Coote at Derry—O'Neill and Coote—O'Neill takes ill before Derry—His death—Supposed to be poisoned—He comes to terms with Ormonde, but too late—His character as a general, a Catholic and a patriot, 289

CHAPTER XVII.

Cromwell—Different opinions about his character—His idea that he had a mission—His early life—His family—His education—The time of his call—He pays ship money—Drainage of the Fens—Description of him by Sir Philip Warwick—Carlyle's commentary on it—He joins the Independents in the House of Commons—Seeks popularity with the army—Pride's Purge—His assumption that he was specially guided by God—His occasional mildness and apparent timidity—He opens the King's coffin—Turns tyrant—Dismisses the Long Parliament—His pious sorrow for having been obliged to do so—Description of him as he then was—Preaching and praying—Burnet's opinion of him—Reticent about his own views, but always trying to sound others—Had the gift of tears—Moves the House of Commons by them—Is compared to Joel, Samson and David—Brings the army to London—Forty-seven members imprisoned and ninety-six excluded from the House—This was called Pride's Purge—The principles of Cromwell and his party—His ambition—Opposition to it—Fairfax—London opposed to Cromwell's ambition—Colonel Jephson's motion—The instrument of government—Sir Christopher Pack's motion—Lambert and Deborrough against kingship—Cromwell tries to win them to his views in vain—The army opposed to them—Being foiled, he refuses the title of King—His spy system—Examples of it—Made England respected abroad—The Dutch ambassador's opinion of him—Striking announcement of his daughter's marriage in Court

	Page.
Gazette (footnote)—His devotion to his family—His design to fight Rome—Worcester fight the "crowning victory"—Deserts his old friends—His Highness the Lord Protector—Treatment of Parliament—Cromwell at Marston Moor—Sir H. Slingsby and Dr. Hewett—Cromwell's last moments and death—His biographers,	306

CHAPTER XVIII.

Ormonde's folly—Army for Ireland—Cromwell made commander-in-chief—His tortuous policy—Hesitates about coming to Ireland—His appearance in the House of Commons—Active preparations—Takes his departure in great State, after preaching a sermon and hearing others from his friends—Letter to his daughter from Bristol—Arrives in Dublin—His order against pillage and cruelty—His reception in Dublin—His summons to Drogheda—Bravery of the garrison—Quarter and no quarter—Inchiquin's opinion—Ormonde's—Lynch in *Cambrensis Eversus*—Duration of the slaughter—The slaughter in the Millmount—Two orders of no-quarter (note)—Dr. Lingard's opinion—Confusion in Cromwell's despatches—Setting up the Mass—What the people really did—Thomas Wood on the Massacre—Cromwell gives all the glory of the sack of Drogheda to God—Opinions of Protestant historians—Mr. Carlyle's opinion—Dundalk, Trim, Carlingford, Newry, Lisburn, and Belfast surrender—Sir C. Coote takes Coleraine, and puts the garrison to the sword—Cromwell marches on Wexford—Takes it—Slaughter there—Inchiquin known to the old Irish as *Morrogh-un-tothaine*—Col. Michael Jones—Wexford people hesitate—Stafford's treason—Terms offered by Cromwell to Wexford—Sacking of Wexford—Great slaughter—Oliver's homily about it—Number killed—Slaughter at the Market Cross—Desecration of the cross—(See note also)—Ireton fails at Duncannon fort—Sir Lucius Taaffe—Ross—Cromwell's idea of freedom of conscience—The southern garrisons and Inchiquin—Cromwell intrigues with them—Colonel Townshend his instrument—Lord Broghill—Cromwell at Waterford—Lieut. General O'Ferrall received into Waterford—His answer to Cromwell—Ormonde is refused a passage through Waterford—Cromwell at Youghal—At Dungarvan—Michael Jones dies there—Supposed to be poisoned—Ormonde wishes to leave Ireland—Persecution in Cork—Colonel Phaire (note)—Cromwell opens his spring campaign—Triumphant progress—Colonel Hewson goes south—Cromwell before Kilkenny—Bribes Tickle—Kilkenny surrendered—Tories (note)—Conduct of Puritan soldiers in Kilkenny—Lord Broghill—Bishop of Ross—His courage—His martyrdom (see note)—Siege of Clonmel—Fennell's treachery—The silver bullet (See note in Appendix)—Articles agreed to—O'Neill's escape—Cromwell leaves Ireland—Bringing our noble to ninepence (note)—Martyrdom of priests—Honours given to Cromwell on his arrival in England—Charles II. takes the Covenant—Fairfax declines the chief command of the army against Scotland—Cromwell accepts it—Defeats the Scots at Dunbar and Worcester—Ulster army—Heber M'Mahon, Bishop of Clogher, chosen general-in-chief—

Gives Coote and Venables battle against advice, and under great disadvantages—Lieut.-General O'Farrell—Henry Roe O'Neill, Owen's son—Defeat of the Northern army at Scarriff-hollis—Charles II. wishes to come to Ireland—He is coldly received everywhere—Comes to Jersey—Invited to Scotland—"Honour and conscience"—Conference at Breda—Montrose—Charles ignores him after his defeat—His cruel execution—The fact of Charles having taken the Covenant reaches Ireland—Assembly at Jamestown—Ormonde appoints two meetings at Loughrea, . 325

CHAPTER XIX.

Ormonde at Limerick—The citizens refuse a garrison from him—Ludlow and Cromwell—Ludlow made general of the horse in Ireland—Ireton before Limerick—Operations at Killaloe—Castlehaven's movements there—Treason of Kelly and Fennell—Castleconnell (note)—The Parliamentarians cross the Shannon at O'Brien's Bridge—Ludlow's account of it—Castlehaven's retirement from Killaloe—"A plain fleeing"—Pass of Ferboe—Ingoldsby forces it—Day of thanksgiving—Offer to treat of surrender—No agreement—Storming party cut off—Expeditions into the country—Bribery—Supplies from England—Sir Teague M'Mahon's Castle taken—Ormonde leaves Ireland—Two Lords—Lieutenant and two Lords Deputy—Muskerry and Broghill—Colonel Fitzpatrick—Coote in Connaught—Curlew mountains—Ballaghy pass—Coote and Clanrickard—Ludlow at Portumna—Athlone taken—Sir J. Dillon and Sir Robert Talbot—Ireton and Ludlow go into Clare—Sir Hardress Waller—People attempt to leave Limerick, but are driven back—Ireton tries to win over O'Neill—O'Neill's reply—Ireton treats with Fennell—He fomented divisions in the city—Most Rev. Dr. O'Brien, Bishop of Emly (note)—Various parties within Limerick—Feeling against Ormonde—O'Neill admitted into the city—Action of the bishops and priests—Limerick betrayed by a conspiracy—The Mayor's conduct—Resolution to treat for peace in 14 days—Council in Court-house, 23rd October—Resolutions passed at it—Excommunication for those resolutions threatened and published—The same night St. John's gate seized by Fennell and others—Fennell's answer to O'Neill—St. John's gate delivered to the enemy, but untruly denied by Fennell—Lord Castleconnell supports Fennell—Proceedings of the besiegers—Treaty made—Twenty-two persons excepted from the benefit of it—Executions—Purcell's cowardice—Geoffrey Barron—Father Woulfe and Bishop of Emly died courageously—The warlike stores found in the city very large—Ireton enters the city—About 2,500 of the defenders march out—O'Neill's defence of himself—His life saved—Missionaries of St. Vincent de Paul in Limerick—Sent by Pope Innocent X.—St. Vincent's address to them—They arrive in Ireland—Wonderful success of their missions—Congratulations from the Nuncio to them—Letter of Bishop of Limerick—St. Vincent's letter—Priests escape as soldiers—The cleric Lye martyred—The Parent House—St. Lazare paid the expense of those missionaries—Many strangers (non-citizens) in Limerick during the

siege—Population of Ireland at this time—Names of the Vincentian missionaries (note)—Meeting of Bishops at Clonmacnoise—Result of meeting—Their meeting with Ormonde at Limerick—His demands—Articles drawn up by the prelates—Ormonde's reply—Letter of Charles II. from Jersey to Ormonde—Dutiful answer—Cromwell's ambition—His offer to Ormonde—Axtel's proposal to the Catholics—Treason of Clanrickard and Castlehaven—Lord Taaffe sent to Brussels—Opinion of the Queen and the Duke of York—Lorraine sends an envoy to Ireland—Lorraine's declaration regarding religion—The curse of Cromwell—The Kirk—Charles II.—Clanrickard—Lorraine's demands—Charles refuses to accede to them—Surrender of Galway, . 374

CHAPTER XX.

Cromwellian Settlement—Rebellion subdued—Adventurers—Committee of Members of Parliament and Adventurers—Terms on which Adventurers subscribed—Sir John Bulstrode Whitelock—Amount of subscriptions—The money diverted from the purpose for which it was subscribed—Battle of Edge Hill—Plantation delayed—Tories—Difficulties of allotting the lands to the Adventurers—Starving out the Irish—Number of Parliament army in Ireland—Departure of the Swordsmen for Spain—Foreign nations glad to receive them—Opinion of the Prince of Orange and of Henri Quatre of Irish valour (note)—Seizure of women and orphans for the Barbadoes—Also prisoners of war—Hewson's proclamation—The Irish "protected"—Penalty for carrying arms, Death—Treatment of Presbyterians—Division into precincts—Commissioners for such precincts—To be Irish and Catholic was to be transportable—The dreadful letters I.P. [Irish Papist] were enough to condemn to Connaught, . 402

CHAPTER XXI.

Great storm at the death of Cromwell—His son Richard proclaimed Protector—Not equal to the post—He is ordered from Whitehall, and the Army rules—Henry Cromwell in Ireland—He was expected to resist his brother's expulsion—but did not—He was allowed to retire into private life and did—Hopes and dangers of the cavaliers—Booth's rising in Cheshire—General Monk—His career—His character—He restores Charles II.—Charles's conduct heaps favours on his enemies, and neglects those who suffered for him—Conduct of the Cromwellians—Their loyal addresses—They offer money to the King—Put forward the old lie that the Irish Papists intended a general rising—The King proclaimed in Dublin—Cromwellians give him £20,000, £4,000 to the Duke of York, and £2,000 to the Duke of Gloucester—They ask a general indemnity for the Protestants, an Act of attainder for others—And a confirmation of all judicial proceedings, &c., from October 23, 1641, to Easter 1660—Catholic owners said to have re-entered on possession by force—See Mr. Prendergast's letter (note)—Agents of Adventurers active in England—Act of indemnity not to extend to Catholics—English Act of Indemnity—Scotch ditto—Three accredited bodies sent to England by Cromwellians and Adventurers—

	Page.
<p>Their demands—Leland's opinion—Ormonde's "haughty commiseration"—King's declaration for the settlement of Ireland—Outburst of Loyalty from Cromwellians—Preamble of bill "a miracle of ingenuity"—The whole government of Cromwell ignored and passed over—But the laws he made were to be retained—<i>Brutum Fulmen</i>—Chief provisions of Act of Settlement—Reason for provisions against Papists—The Nominees (note)—Commissioners sat in Dublin—Opinion of judges—Parliament of 1661—Mervyn chosen speaker—Constitution of this Parliament—Oath of Supremacy to be taken—A new rebellion invented—Report on it—It fell through—Conditions for "Innocency,"—Note on those conditions—A principle of Napoleon I.—What about innocent "Cromwellians"?—Loyalty of Catholics—"Floreat Rex" motto of the Confederation—Motive of the Cromwellians in calling the Irish Catholics rebels—Act of Settlement—Improvident grants to Ormonde and others—Alarm of the Soldiers and Adventurers at the number of decrees of Innocency passed—Defiance of decency and justice by the occupiers of the lands—Rebellion concocted—consequent persecution—priests apprehended—Catholics driven from the towns—Houses of Catholic gentry searched for arms, &c.—Ormonde's treachery to the Catholics—Court of claims—Catholic claims proved, in spite of suborned, perjured witnesses—Petty's boast—Court of claims closed before Catholics were heard—Every "innocent" transplanted to Connaught was a Catholic—Ormonde—Bill of Explanation—Only about one-fifth of the Catholic claims heard—The forty-nine officers—Their case—officers who served the King abroad—Protestant Ascendancy—Trial and martyrdom of Oliver Plunkett, Primate of Ireland,</p>	424

CHAPTER XXII.

Charles and James naturally leaned to the Catholic Faith—their mother being a Catholic—Charles for political reasons sanctioned persecuting laws against the Catholics—James's open avowal of Catholicity on coming to the throne—Strong Protestant feeling excited against him in consequence—Speech to the Council—His position as King of England—Liberates Catholics and dissenters in jail for their religion—Hatred of Popery—Terror of it—Sudden conversion of large numbers from the Episcopalian church—Pamphlets against the Catholics—The dissenters joined the Episcopalians against the King after a time—They pretend James was not a real friend to civil and religious liberty—They were always asserting his acts were not in accordance with his real sentiments, because it served their purpose to do so—If James played hypocrite, and pretended to be a Protestant, his crown would be secure—C. J. Fox's opinion—Argument from the massacre of fanatics in Scotland—Why Mr. Fox's opinion is specially valuable—King's "State of the Protestants," &c.—Heads of indictment against James by Dr. King, based upon assumptions—(1) That the Protestants were the people of Ireland; (2) That it is only the persecution inflicted on Episcopalian Protestants that is a crime—Dr. King's

eulogium on liberty—His opposition to a toleration bill in favour of dissenters—No toleration for Catholics—Burnet's high eulogium on King's "State of the Protestants"—Dr. Mant's remarkable silence about it—Talbot, Duke of Tyrconnell—His outspoken manner—James gives him rapid promotion—King's attack upon him—King a great eulogist of James at first—Note on Rev. Charles Leslie—Swift's eulogium upon him—Dr. King's various promotions—His disappointment at not having been made Primate—Rapid changes in loyalty of Protestants—cause of it—Dr. King's statement about the seizure of Protestant churches by the Catholics—His assumption of the non-existence of Catholics in Ireland—Their numbers as compared with the Protestants at the time—James's kindness to the Protestants—Opposite opinions about yielding allegiance to a Catholic King—Dr. King's opinion about the sacrifices that ought to be made to preserve liberty—James quits Ireland for France—His habits at St. Germain's—His death—Wade's commentary on his devotions—Leslie's estimate of James's career and character—Repeal of the Act of Settlement and Explanation—James opposed to their having been passed—Urged Lord Granard and others to oppose them, 451

CHAPTER XXIII.

Protestantism of the Stuarts—James the Second's sacrifices for his religious convictions—Liberality to the Dissenters—William III.—Views of Tories—Of Whigs—William's education and training—Action of the Duke of York's enemies (note)—Burnet—Difficulties as to whether William and his wife should reign—His decision—James lands at Kinsale—Col. Hamilton—Lord Granard—William's declaration about the Catholics—Sarsfield's refusal to carry a letter from William to Tyrconnell—William neglects Irish affairs—A great error—Sees his error and raises an army sufficient to reduce Ireland—It was a motley army consisting of twenty-three newly-raised English regiments, two Dutch battalions, four regiments of French refugees, Inniskilliners, Scotch regiments, and 6,000 hired Danes—Schomberg made Commander-in-Chief (*vide* note)—Landed at Carrickfergus 12th August—Violation of Articles made there—Story's account—The true account—Schomberg marches to Dundalk—Mortality in his army there—William perplexed between the two English parties—His unpopularity—He is ridiculed and nicknamed Hooknose, &c.—Declares he will return to Holland—Is dissuaded from it and comes to Ireland—Battle of the Boyne—The Queen's letter about the state of the Protestant Church in Ireland—William proceeds towards Dublin and halts at Finglass—Publishes a declaration—Moves to Crumlin—On to Castledermot, Carlow, Kilkenny, Carrick, Waterford, Duncannon—All surrendered to him without a blow—He arrived before Limerick on the 8th of August, which, on being summoned, refused to surrender—Ginkle arrives—Sarsfield's success at Ballyneety—William goes on with the siege—Breach made 12 yards wide—Limerick stormed with 10,000 picked soldiers—Determined fighting—The Irish retire some distance

into the city, followed by the Williamites, but turning suddenly on the latter, they hurl missiles of every kind with the most deadly effect upon them—The Brandenburgers blown up—William hurries from Limerick—Burning of the hospital there (note)—Marlborough and the Duke of Wirtumburg invest Cork—It is taken, and also Kinsale, . . . 471

CHAPTER XXIV.

The English come before Athlone—The English town taken—Fierce contention for the bridge—Irish break the bridge all but one arch at their own side—The English plank the broken arches—The Irish destroy the planks—Close gallery made by the English—Burned by the Irish—The English take to the river, sixty of them in armour—The town yields for want of succour from St. Ruth—The Irish army falls back on Aughrim—Death of St. Ruth—English give no quarter—Sarsfield ignorant of St. Ruth's plans—De Ginkle's generalship faulty—Galway invested—Baldearg O'Donnell—Galway taken—English army arrive before Limerick—The siege having lasted a month the garrison beat a parley and send out terms which are rejected—Ultimately the famous treaty of Limerick was agreed to—Its provisions—Intended to confer religious liberty—Mr. Froude's adroitness—Omitted Article restored by William—His reasons for restoring it—The cause of the omission—William bound himself to summon a Parliament—He did so, but the articles of Limerick were not brought before it—Hope of extirpating the Irish and old English (note)—Sheriffs and others act as if no Articles had been made—Harris's opinion—Another Parliament held in 1695—Capel the Lord Deputy *made no reference to the Articles of Limerick*, but urged the making of such laws as would prevent "their enemies" [the Catholics] from ever being able to give them any further trouble—Bills of pains and penalties re-transmitted from England—Education—Catholics excluded from Parliament—£5, highest price for a Papist's horse—Catholics deprived of fire-arms—Catholic apprentices not to be taken by gunsmiths and cutlers—Laws against rapparees—Baronies made responsible for them—Not to be harboured—£20 reward for a proclaimed Tory dead or alive—Articles of Limerick brought forward—Flagrant violations of them and alterations in them—Magistrates fined for not putting the penal laws in force against the Catholics—Laws against Catholic bishops and priests—Apologists of William—No real excuse for his conduct—Establishment of the woollen manufactures in Ireland, . . . 486

CHAPTER XXV.

Reign of Anne—Anne always in the hands of favourites—The Duchess of Marlborough—Anne neglected by William III.—The true relation between him and the English people—Anne ungrateful to Ireland—James, the second Duke of Ormonde, appointed Lord Lieutenant—His antecedents and character (note)—No pretence for the new penal laws against the Irish Catholics—Edmund Burke's opinion—Ormonde opens the

	Page.
Session of Parliament—Bill against “the further growth of Popery”—Burnet’s opinion—Clause against dissenters—Its object—Petitioned against by the dissenters—Their opposition withdrawn lest the bill would be rejected—Object of the penal laws against Catholics—Chief clauses of the bill to prevent the further growth of Popery—Clause about excluding Papists from corporate towns, especially Limerick and Galway—Lawyers against the Act as a violation of the treaty of Limerick—Astounding answer of the Irish Parliament—Act of Explanation, making the original Act more severe—Discoverers—their occupation—their rewards—Perversion of law—Mr. Howard’s pity for the Catholics—Penal legislation continued in the reign of George—Militia law-fines—Disfranchisement of the Catholics in 1727—Proselytizing Education—Vast number of Schools for this purpose—Erasmus Smith’s foundations—The Blue Coat hospital—The Foundling hospital—The Charter schools—Schools of Irish Church Missions—Mr. Dallas—His editors—Bibles and Testaments printed—Mission in Island of Achill—Mr. Nangle—Present state of the Mission there—Money spent in Achill—Irish Church Missions—Nassau W. Senior—Dr. Whately—Scriptural Education—Its power over an Oxford man less than over a peasant!—Dingle—Mrs. Thompson—Collections in England—Cottages built for perverts—Mr. Monck Mason—Collections—Lord Ventry—Miss Mahon—Memorandums made in Ireland—Dr. Forbes—Correspondence between Chancellor Webster and Mr. Eade—Sham controversial discussions—The Birds’ Nest, Kingstown—Training there—Missionary effort in Belfast!—Mr. Dallas—His success,	505

NOTES	555
-----------------	-----

APPENDIX.

I.—Act for Registering the Popish clergy, with examples of the manner in which it was done,	561
II.—Rev. Mr. Webster’s final letter on the Irish Church Missions, 581	
III.—The passage from Archbishop Whately’s Charge referred to in page 531,	588

THE BATTLE OF THE FAITH IN IRELAND.

CHAPTER I.

THE English were more than three hundred and fifty years in Ireland when King Henry the Eighth threw off the Pope's supremacy. During that long period the battle which was waged on Irish soil lay between the natives and their invaders; as both were Catholics, the dispute was not of a religious kind, it was simply territorial; the natives struggling to hold their country, the invaders endeavouring to seize it. The rejection of Papal supremacy by Henry, therefore, produced a great change in Irish affairs; thenceforth, with but brief intervals, the English interest and the Protestant interest were regarded as identical. Not that the people of English and Norman blood in Ireland accepted the king's supremacy any more than the Irish did. Far from it, on its first introduction they rejected it with indignation, and in later times chiefs of that blood were amongst the accepted and the most trusted defenders of the ancient faith. But all who sought wealth or distinction through the favour of the Crown accepted, either really or apparently, the spiritual headship of the reigning monarch. The first to accept it, even before George Browne was made Archbishop of Dublin, were two members of a leading Norman family, namely, the Earl of Ossory, and Lord Butler, father and son; for which the latter was created Viscount Thurles, and made Admiral of Ireland, whilst both were jointly appointed governors of the counties of Kilkenny, Waterford, and Tipperary, together with the territories of Ossory and Ormond.*

The prelacy and Parliament of England came over to the king's religious views with a readiness quite surprising, and which must

* "On the 11th of May [1535] the Lord Butler was created Viscount Thurles and Admiral of Ireland, and on the 21st his father (the Earl of Ossory) and he were made governors of the counties of Kilkenny, Waterford, and Tipperary, and the territories of Ossory and Ormond; and they promised to do their utmost endeavour to recover the castle of Dungarvan, and to resist the usurpation of the Bishop of Rome, which is the first engagement I have met with of that kind." Sir Richard Cox's *Hibernia Anglicana*. Reign of Henry the 8th, p. 240. The italics and capitals are Cox's. He quotes for his authority, Lib. H. Lambeth.

have been very gratifying to a prince of his temper. Elated with his success, he determined to have those views adopted in Ireland, or at least in that portion of it which acknowledged his authority. To effect this fitting instruments were necessary, and amongst the first of them that became available was George Browne, Provincial of the Augustinians, and resident in a house of the Order in London, who brought himself prominently into notice, by preaching up the doctrines which he knew were pleasing to the king's favourite and Vicar-General, Cromwell.*

Allen, Archbishop of Dublin, having been seized and cruelly murdered in attempting to escape from that city to England, Henry took the opportunity of appointing Browne to the vacant See, and of making him, it would seem, head of a commission entrusted with the task of spreading the new tenets in Ireland.†

This appointment may be regarded as the beginning of that religious struggle in Ireland which, carried on in a variety of ways, and by widely different means, has now endured for three centuries and a half, and is not yet ended ; nor does he live who can forecast its termination. It is proudly boasted that the flag of England has braved, for a thousand years, the battle and the breeze ; it may, with at least equal truth, be said, that since the day Henry the Eighth of England appointed the English apostate friar to the See of Dublin, the flag of Irish Catholic Faith has braved every assault. No courage of armed assailants, no power of the most potent monarchs, no wicked violation of solemn treaties, no amount of crafty diplomacy, no persecution however ruthless and bloody, no hoards of untold wealth, thrown open before the eyes of a starving people, have been able to strike down this stainless flag, so bravely has it withstood the battle. As to the breeze, no matter whence it blew, or how fiercely, it only ruffled it for a time, but to no greater extent

* The place where this convent stood is still called Austin Friars ; a dingy locality in which offices and Boards of Directors are plentiful.

† It is doubtful whether any real Commission was formed. In a letter, part of which is printed in the *Harleian Miscellany* (vol. 5, p. 595), Thomas Cromwell writes to Browne that the king "was fallen absolutely from Rome in spiritual matters within his dominion of England," and that it was "his royal will and pleasure to have his subjects there in Ireland to obey his commands as in England." He then nominates George Browne one of his Commissioners "for the execution thereof." Some time after Archbishop Browne writes, how, "almost to the danger and hazard of his temporal life," he laboured to carry out the king's commission, but he makes no allusion to his fellow-commissioners, if he had any. Staples, Bishop of Meath, in a letter to St. Leger, denouncing his brother of Dublin, seems to allude to a pretended commission, when he says, "And he [Browne] hath gotten one Sylvester joined with him, as he saith, in our Master's authority." Letter of 15th June, 1538, in *Collections on Irish History by the Very Rev. L. F. O'Renehan*, p. 170.

than to keep it in graceful motion, and to show its folds of green and gold to greater advantage in the light of heaven.

George Browne's episcopate was neither a successful one nor a happy one; his attempts to propagate the new doctrines were an utter failure. The Catholics, Irish and Palesmen, were resolutely opposed to him, and he tells his master, Thomas Cromwell, that it was "almost to the danger and hazard of his temporal life that he was endeavouring to procure the nobility and gentry to due obedience, in owning his highness [the king] their supreme head as well spiritual as temporal." The people were still worse, for he thus naïvely writes of them:—"The common people of this isle are more zealous in their blindness than the saints and martyrs were in the truth at the beginning of the Gospel."*

Henry had another Irish prelate devoted to his interests—Staples of Meath—who was appointed to that See in 1530. "He was instrumental and active in all the changes of religion which happened at this time," says Ware, "and joined with Archbishop Browne in opposition to his metropolitan, Primate Dowdall, in introducing the Liturgy in English, for which he afterwards suffered"—that is, suffered the loss of his bishopric in Mary's reign. Although these two men are said to be joined in carrying out the king's wishes, there existed a fierce and continual feud between them. Why this was so does not clearly appear, but it probably arose from rivalry, as each, no doubt, had his heart fixed on the primacy. Browne also quarrelled with the Lord Deputy, Leonard Gray, than whom no man of his time did more for the advancement of English interests in Ireland. Writing to Thomas Cromwell in May, 1538, he, amongst many other complaints, says:—"I think the simplest holy water clerk is better esteemed than I am [that is by the king's friends in Ireland]. I beseech your Lordship, in the way of charity, either cause my authority to take effect, or else let me return home again, into the cloister. When I was at the worst [there] I was in better care than I am now; what with my Lord Deputy, the Bishop of Meath, and the pecuniose prior of Kylmaynham. God send remedy, who ever have your lordship in his safe tuition."†

It would have been some consolation to Archbishop Browne, in his troubles, had he secured the confidence and approbation of that monarch for whose cause, as he asserted, he had endured so much; but Henry seems to have regarded him

* Letter to Thomas Cromwell of 4th Sept., 1535. Given *in extenso* by Cox, Vol. 1, p. 246.

† Browne to Cromwell, 20th May, 1538.

as a vain good-for-nothing clerical coxcomb; which opinion he took care to express to him in the strongest terms. He tells him that before his promotion, he had manifested much zeal and affection in preaching the Word of God, and in promoting his [the king's] interests, but he now finds to his utter disappointment, that he [Browne] neither devoted himself to the instruction of the people, nor to the advancement of the king's interests. He further accuses him of "lightness of behaviour," "pride," of "glorying in foolish ceremonies," of delighting in "we" and "us," and so dreaming of "comparing himself so nearly to a prince in honour and estimation, that all virtue and honesty had almost departed from him." He warns him to reform himself, or that he who had made him an archbishop will remove him and put "a man of more virtue and honesty in his place." Poor Browne's letter in reply is one of the most striking specimens of slavish meanness to be found; and it is brought out into still higher relief by the manly independence of the Catholic prelates, who set the royal tyrant at defiance. Browne writes to Henry that the perusal of his "most gracious letters" not only caused him to take "fruitful and gracious monitions," but made him "tremble in body for fear of incurring his majesty's displeasure." He makes the best apology he can for his shortcomings in the king's service, and for his affectation of princely dignity, and finally beseeches the king "to accept the same, as if he [Browne] were personally doing his duty, approaching his majesty *on his knees*." He adds, that "should he preach the Gospel of Christ otherwise than he had previously done before his majesty," in denouncing the "Papistical power," or should he be remiss in advancing the king's interests in every way, he fervently prays that "*the ground might open and swallow him*."*

At what period Browne, ex-friar and archbishop, entered what he assumed to be the state of matrimony, does not appear. According to the civil law it would have been illegal to do so before the 19th of February, 1549, the third year of Edward the 6th's reign. By an Act of that year (cap. 21), marriage was permitted to such persons in holy orders *as could not remain continent*; "although it were better," the Act recites, "not only for the estimation of priests, and other ministers in the Church of God, to live chaste, soul and spirit, from the company of women;" but considering the many inconveniences which arose from a

* See both letters in Dr. O'Renahan's Collections, pp. 164-5. About the same time Henry wrote to Staples of Meath a letter of similar import as that addressed to Browne (1537).

state of compulsory chastity, it was enacted that "all laws and canons forbidding the marriage of priests shall be void of whatever state, condition, or degree." Celibacy, however, was strongly recommended to such clerics as could remain continent. This Act was repealed by Mary.

Dowdall, who had been deprived of the primacy in Edward's reign, because he opposed the introduction of the Liturgy in English, and who had prudently retired to the Continent, returned soon after Mary's accession, and was restored to his See of Armagh. He held a Synod at Drogheda to reform the abuses introduced in the two previous reigns, and in April, 1554, he, in conjunction with Walsh, bishop-elect of Meath, received a commission, authorising him to deprive married clergy of their benefices, under which Browne of Dublin, Staples of Meath, Lancaster of Kildare, and Travers of Leighlin, were removed from their Sees. Bale of Ossory and Casey of Limerick fled beyond the seas.*

Politically, Mary's Government in Ireland was of a piece with that of previous reigns, and no one ever hunted down the native chieftains more vigorously, or seized their territories with more unflinching zeal, than did her Lord Deputy, the Earl of Sussex.† She, however, took the same measures to re-establish Catholicity in Ireland as she did in England, so that her reign in this country is justly enough described by O'Sullivan in these words:—"Henry and Edward having been taken out of life, Mary, a Catholic queen, who married Philip the 2nd, a Spanish prince, began to reign. Although she endeavoured to sustain and increase the Catholic religion in Ireland, her lieutenants and advisers desisted not from inflicting injuries upon the Irish."‡

The way in which most Protestant historians commonly deal with Mary's efforts to restore the Catholic religion in Ireland, is, to use a mild word, most ingenious. They write as if Protestantism was a settled well-established form of worship amongst us at her accession, and they enlarge upon the persecution which bishops and others underwent in being deprived of their livings

* Cox, Vol. 1, p. 299. Ware's Bishops, p. 92.

I have not been able to discover the text of this Commission. Walsh, in a petition addressed to Philip and Mary regarding the temporalities of his See, and his consecration, says he was sent into Ireland, at his own cost, by commission, to deprive certain married bishops and priests.

Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls, p. 337. temp. Philip and Mary.

† Sussex does not appear to have been hampered with anything like strict principles: "Under Mary he had called a Parliament to establish, under Elizabeth he called another to abolish, the Catholic worship." Lingard's England, Vol. 6, p. 155. Ed. 1855.

‡ *Hist. Cath. Hiberniæ, cap. 10.* Dub. 1850.

by her, whereas the original legitimate Catholic occupiers of those livings were in many cases (as in Dowdall's) still alive, having been deprived by mere secular authority in Henry and Edward's reigns. The new doctrines were still crude and unsettled—forced, to be sure, on the servants of the Crown by the sovereign's authority, but totally unaccepted by the people, even within the narrow limits of the Pale. Moreover, they were scarcely a generation old, the life and soul of them being the denial of the Pope's supremacy; which dogma, as everybody knows, was founded on Henry's quarrel with the Pope, because he would not allow him to repudiate his lawful wife, Catharine, and so bastardize his daughter Mary, then reigning by rightful succession, and by the undoubted will of the people. That she should endeavour to restore the religion which had flourished in England from the days of St. Augustine, and in Ireland from the days of St. Patrick, was the most natural proceeding in the world—a consequence in fact, of her position then as a Catholic princess, and the daughter of Catherine of Arragon.*

ELIZABETH succeeded to the throne in November, 1558. She hastened to reverse Mary's legislation regarding the Catholics, and not only to re-enact the statutes of Henry and Edward against them, but to pass new ones of wider application and greater severity, although she had gone to Mass and received Communion according to the Catholic rite before, and for some time after, her accession. Thomas Earl of Sussex was Mary's Lord Deputy in Ireland, at the time of her death; he was continued in the post by Elizabeth, as he made no difficulty about changing sides, or reversing his own chief acts during Mary's reign.† Cecil, in an autograph letter, sent him his instructions, one of which was to call a Parliament, which he accordingly did. This, the famous Parliament of 1559-60, was constituted as follows ‡—

* Henry was nineteen years married to Catharine before any scruples arose in his mind as to the lawfulness of his marriage; and it is conjectured, not without cause, that they might not even then have arisen, only he had fallen in love with Anna Boleyn, the beautiful and accomplished daughter of Sir Thomas Boleyn; who told him with spirit, when he revealed his passion, that "she could not be his wife, and would not be his mistress."

† The native annalists say of Sussex that "He polluted the temples of God throughout Ireland; uprooted and overturned the altars wherever he met them; expelled the orthodox bishops and the clergy and all members of religious houses; drove out the nuns from their sanctified retreats, and introduced the Lutheran religion, the Lutheran Liturgy and the heterodox faith, wherever he could."—*Arthur MSS.*, quoted in Lenihan's *History of Limerick*, p. 95.

Note :—‡ At this period the legal year began on 24th March, the civil year on the 1st January; hence transactions occurring in January, February,

1. The number of members summoned to the House of Commons was seventy-six; of these twenty were returned from ten counties, and fifty-six from twenty-eight cities and boroughs, for the most part the *fortresses*, and therefore the strongholds of the English. (2) There was no county member for any part of Ulster or Connaught, although parts of both provinces had been represented in preceding Parliaments. Both provinces together had only *six* borough members; so that two provinces—the full half of Ireland—had only six members out of seventy-six, and no county member at all! Munster sent but sixteen members. Three provinces, therefore, Ulster, Munster, and Connaught, taken together were represented by just TWENTY-TWO members; the other fifty-four having been returned by a *portion* only of the province of Leinster. “Will anyone pretend that the votes of such a Parliament can, with any propriety, be considered the will of the Commons of Ireland? but this is the Parliament, it is pretended, that established the Protestant religion in Ireland.”*

In Henry's and Edward's time the chief religious changes insisted upon were the royal supremacy and the English Liturgy; in Elizabeth's instructions to Sussex, as to what the Parliament was to do regarding religion, many more changes were suggested. This Parliament sat just one month, from the 12th of January to the 12th of February, 1559-60, during which the Penal laws called for by the queen were enacted. They were chiefly the following:—1. That [what was *humorously* called in the statute] the *ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical and spiritual* be restored to the Crown, and foreign authority (meaning the Pope's) be abolished.† 2. That the queen and her successors may appoint Commissioners to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction. 3. That all officers and ministers ecclesiastical or lay; all ecclesiastical persons, and *everyone that has the queen's wages*, shall take the oath of supremacy, on pain of losing his office. 4. He that sues Livery, or takes orders must take the said oath. This was no trifling work for a one month Parlia-

and up to 24th March were civilly belonging to one year, legally to another. This Parliament was held between the 12th of January and the 12th of February; legally these months belonged to 1559, civilly to 1560; hence both dates are given as above 1559-60.

* “*Dissertations on Irish History.*” By Rev. M. Kelly, D.D.

† Elizabeth did not approve of being styled Head of the Church, because Calvin blamed her father Henry for having assumed it. In the oath prescribed for Archbishops, Bishops, Prelates, and Clergy the wording was:—“That the Queen's highness is the *only supreme governess* of this realm and of all other her Highness's dominions and countries, in all *spiritual or ecclesiastical things and causes as temporal.*” *Sanders*, p 298.

ment. By these enactments there could be no more priests ordained in Ireland, for all who took orders should swear the queen and not the Pope was head of the Church. To *sue Livery* meant the action of a *rightful, lawful heir*, asking legal possession of property which was incontestably his; but he could not get legal possession of it without taking the oath of supremacy; so that by this law Catholic proprietorship was annihilated in Ireland. No son could succeed to his father's estate, no heir could inherit property he was heir to, unless he first swore on the Holy Evangelists that Queen Elizabeth was supreme head of the Church. 5. That he who shall maintain or advance foreign jurisdiction (the Pope's, of course) shall, for the first offence, lose his goods, and if they be not worth £20 (a sum equal to about £100 at present) then he is to suffer a year's imprisonment without bail; and if the person be an ecclesiastic he shall likewise lose all his benefices. For the second offence *præmunire* was incurred, which meant contempt of the Sovereign and Government, and for which almost any punishment short of death could be inflicted. A third offence was to be adjudged high treason.

Here is an onslaught upon the Catholic Faith in Ireland almost before the queen had ceased to attend Mass.

The machinery seems to have been singularly complete and effective for its purpose—the destruction of Catholicity in Ireland in a single generation as far as English influence extended; but Elizabeth had other arrows in her quiver, one of which was the “Plantation of Munster.” No doubt she and her council looked forward to the “plantation” of all Ireland, but as this could only be accomplished by degrees, they seized the opportunity afforded them by the attainder of the Earl of Desmond to begin with Munster.

The great power and vast possessions of this nobleman stood in the way of Elizabeth's design of peopling Munster with English Protestants, and when he broke into rebellion against her, she and her advisers were rather pleased than otherwise, as it gave them the opportunity of getting rid of him, and of thereby clearing the ground for the Plantation. If he were permitted the quiet enjoyment of his estates, it is hard to see what object he could have had in quarrelling with Elizabeth, a proceeding, as he well knew, of the utmost danger to him. The common opinion, therefore, seems by no means an ill-founded one, that he was goaded into rebellion for the purpose of declaring him a traitor, that his lands might be seized. The most trivial reasons are given by Cox and others for suspecting him of disloyalty—one being that when invited to the English camp by the Deputy, he

excused himself from going there. And good reasons had the wary Earl for remaining away, the Deputy's camp being a highly dangerous place to Irish Chieftains; for in those days it was a common trick to induce them to enter an English walled town or camp on pretence of a friendly interview being desired by the Lord Deputy or officer in command; but once there, unheard of charges were trumped up against them, on the strength of which they were made prisoners, and sent as such to Dublin or London, whence they did not always return. Examples of this occurred in the Earl's own family, he himself being one of the examples; for after the treacherous attack made upon him by the Butlers at Affane in 1565, where he was wounded and taken prisoner by them, he was sent to England, to *account for his conduct*; and when there, to use an expressive phrase of Cox's, "he was clapt into the Tower," where he had plenty of leisure to nurse his broken leg.*

After some time a commission was issued under the broad seal of England and directed to Sir Henry Sydney, the Lord Deputy, to take the examinations of Desmond and Ormonde, and to make his award thereupon. But besides the Commission, Elizabeth wrote a private letter to Sydney touching the affair; it was intentionally obscure, but through its hazy phraseology one can see, and she meant that Sydney should see, the great desire she had that the decision should be against Desmond, and in favour of Ormonde. Doubtless, a chief reason for this was that Desmond was a Catholic, and the recognised head of the Catholics, whilst Ormonde like previous members of his family, was an active favourer of the Protestant cause. Sydney saw Elizabeth's meaning, and declined to carry on the investigation unless other Commissioners were sent from England to assist him; this having been done a reconciliation was patched up between the two Earls, which, however, was not of long duration.

Some writers say Sydney's Government of Ireland was so severe that even the queen took alarm at it. I am bound to say I think the matter was rather the other way; for great as Sydney's severity was, it does not seem to have been sufficient to satisfy

* The following anecdote is given in nearly all the Histories of Ireland: "As the Ormondians conveyed him [Desmond] from the field, stretched on a bier, his supporters exclaimed, with a natural triumph, 'Where is now the great Earl of Desmond?' he had spirit to reply—'Where, but in his proper place? Still upon the necks of the Butlers.'" Leland quotes for this, Cox and the Lambeth MSS. so frequently referred to by Cox; but Dr. O'Donovan does not believe it to be authentic, and says, "This anecdote, however, is from Romantic writers, and not worthy the serious notice of the historian." *Four Masters*, Vol. 5, p. 1603, note.

Elizabeth. Her panegyrist Cox says of him, that after settling the province of Ulster "as well as possible," he returned to Dublin with the applause of the people [of the Pale]. Cox adds:—"But howsoever these good services were relished in Ireland, where the fruits of them were felt and perceived, yet in England they were so little regarded that no mention was made of them in any of the public despatches; but on the contrary the public letters to the Deputy were full of reprimands and sharp reflections, because of the insolence of the Earl of Desmond; and therefore the Lord Deputy did endeavour his own revocation, and at length prevailed to get license to go to England."* The fact was, Ormonde had the ear of the queen and her council far more than the Lord Deputy had, whom Ormonde kept denouncing as a favourer of Desmond, although this was by no means the case; but it was a heinous crime in Elizabeth's eyes to show any justice or fair play to Desmond.

A full exposition of the causes which led to the outlawry of Gerald, sixteenth Earl of Desmond, (commonly called the great Earl) at the close of 1579 does not come within the scope of this work; it may, however, be fairly assumed that one of the principal causes was a longing desire to seize on his vast possessions. The English, civil and military, in Ireland, were greedy adventurers with small pay ill paid; and they, therefore, relied more on their expected share of the forfeited estates than upon any regular income. Peace was hateful to them, and they excited and promoted rebellion in every way they could, that rebels might be shot down or hung up (no matter which) to clear the land for their occupation. The government in England was quite aware of this feeling, winked at and encouraged it; the Queen herself regarded forfeited lands in Ireland as the fitting reward of those adventurers, and the speediest and readiest means of protestantizing the country, for she had more than hinted that the insurrection of Shane O'Neill was all the better for the loyalists, as it would leave plenty of lands for them.†

On the death of the Earl of Desmond in 1583, six hundred thousand acres of land, his property and that of his adherents, were declared forfeited to the Crown.‡ This at once opened the way for carrying out the long meditated scheme of the plant-

* Cox, p. 306.

† Haverty, p. 403.

‡ The quantity said to be forfeited was 574,628 acres, but these figures were founded on imperfect and fraudulent surveys; the real acreage was much greater.

ation of Munster. In the 28th year of her reign the queen caused to be drawn up an elaborate plan for peopling that province with her English "loving subjects of good behaviour and account;" persons of Irish origin being specially excluded. Of course such as did not acknowledge her spiritual supremacy were not regarded by her as of "good behaviour and account," and hence those English who still persisted in remaining Catholics could have no share in the lands of Munster. In fact some years later, in a renewal of the Commission for the partition of those lands, one of the orders she gave to the Commissioners was to diligently examine whether any Englishmen, being recusants, are come thither to inhabit, and how they behave themselves.*

In pursuance of this scheme letters were written to every county in England, to encourage younger brothers to become "undertakers" in Ireland. The plantation was completed in seven years, in which brief period all Munster was to become English and protestant; for not only were persons of Irish origin

* Patent and Close Rolls [Ireland] reg. Eliz. p. 355. *Recusants*, in England, were at first such Catholics as refused to take the oath of supremacy. Formal legislation against them may be said to have commenced in the first years of Elizabeth's reign, when by an Act [cap. 2] of her first Parliament, Recusancy was made punishable by an ascending scale of penalties from the forfeiture of real and personal property to the infliction of death. In latter times, Recusants were, by the laws of England, enmeshed in such an iron net-work of penal statutes, that the wonder is how any of them continued to exist at all. 1. It was recusancy to assist at Mass. 2. It was a much greater act of recusancy to say Mass. 3. It was recusancy not to attend the Protestant Church on Sundays and other appointed days. 4. A Recusant could not inherit, purchase, or otherwise acquire lands. 5. He could not hold any public office. 6. He could not keep arms in his house. 7. He could not *appear* within ten miles of London, under a penalty of £100 (a sum equal to £400 or £500 at present). 8. He could not travel more than five miles from home without a license. 9. He could not bring any action in law or equity. 10. He could not have baptism, marriage or burial performed except by a Protestant minister. In England itself Recusancy was not so severely punished; but Judge Saxey, one of James the First's judges, maintained that the English statute by which the above penalties were enacted, applied to and was in force in Ireland: a view, which although favoured by Sir John Davys, was new, unconstitutional and indefensible. There was no Irish statute authorising the banishment of the Catholic clergy, so the right of doing so was *assumed* by a Proclamation published in 1604 by Sir Henry Bruncker, President of Munster, in which "all Jesuits, Seminaries, and Massing priests" were commanded to leave the country. Sir John Davys knew there was no *Irish* law, and, therefore no law binding in Ireland, to warrant this, but with his habitual cleverness he said that "if a proclamation were made by the king for their banishment, they would probably fly, or if they could be apprehended they might be imprisoned in Ireland, or else sent into England, where the penal laws would take hold of their persons." At this time there was no *Habeas Corpus Act* to prevent imprisonment unless for some breach of the known laws: the king's pleasure was enough. See Preface to Calendar of State Papers, vol. ii., pp. lxxi.—ii.—iii.

excluded from becoming Colonists, but the English Colonists were forbidden to have Irish as labourers or servants of any kind, the rule laid down by the queen being that "none of the meer Irish were to be maintained in any family." In the days of Catholic agitation when our patriots fired the people's blood by telling them they were "hewers of wood and drawers of water" in their native land, they understated the case; what they should have said was that we were excluded by the English law from the poor privilege of hewing wood or drawing water for the oppressors to whom that land was parcelled out by queen Elizabeth—parcelled out, too, as a reward for cutting the throats of our ancestors, the rightful owners.* And this spirit continued to our own times, for I am old enough to remember hearing the people say that no protestant family would hire a Catholic servant, if they could get a protestant; and when they were necessitated to hire a Catholic, they often compelled him to attend the family protestant prayers morning and evening.

The plantation of Munster did not succeed as well as Elizabeth had hoped. The English Undertakers, having come to Ireland to live as gentlemen at large, had no idea of soiling their hands with work of any kind; so they coolly ignored their contract with the queen, by permitting the natives to become their servants and slaves. But to those wretched beings all spiritual aid from their own pastors was denied; they could assist at no Mass; were permitted to see no priest; they were doomed to live like heathens or embrace the new doctrines, which they refused to do with a perseverance that seems almost incredible. To be sure priests lurked in hiding places, hoping now and then to get the opportunity of doing something to keep the faith alive in their hearts, but this was at the peril of their lives, as was soon shown by the martyrdoms that followed. Sydney in a tour he made through Munster, marked his route with continuous slaughter, and gloried in it. In one of his despatches he says:—"I write not the names of each particular varlet that hath died since I arrived, as well by the ordinary course of law, and the martial law, as flat fighting with them, when they would take food without the good will of the giver, *for I think it no stuff worthy the loading of my letters with*; but I do assure you the number of them is great, and some of the best, and the rest tremble; for most part

* Cox, Vol. 1, p. 393, describes an "Undertaker" to mean a person who came as a Colonist to Ireland, accepting the conditions laid down for the Colonisation, and who *undertook* to carry them out. It was probably expected, too, that he would enact the part of a modern *Undertaker*, by burying as many as he could of the "meer Irishe" under their native sod.

they fight for their dinner, and many of them lose their heads before they be served with supper. Down they go in every corner, and down they shall go, God willing.”*

Connaught suffered much in Elizabeth's reign, but was not and could not be cleared for an English protestant colony as Munster was. In previous times the battle in Ireland was between English and Irish—Saxon and native—but a new element was introduced by the new religion, and to be English and loyal after the old pattern was no longer sufficient; in Elizabeth's time, one should be protestant as well as English, before being regarded as loyal. This was too much for many of English descent, who stoutly refused to give up the religion of their fathers. The great English or rather Anglo-Norman House of Fitzgerald was the foremost in standing by the old faith. In fact the Geraldines were appointed by the Pope as heads and leaders of the league which he formed to sustain it. The nobles of Connaught, as Catholics, were, it may be presumed, well inclined to join this league, but if there had been no league and no religious persecution, the savage cruelty of Fitton's government was quite enough to goad them into rebellion—a cruelty only surpassed by that of Sir Richard Bingham, who has been most justly styled the “Cromwell of Connaught.”†

* Sydney's despatches preserved in British Museum MSS. Cot. Titus, B. X. (*Hav.* 396).

† By Rev. M. Kelly, in a note to his edition of O'Sullivan's History, p. 127.

CHAPTER II.

THE Catholic religion was not persecuted in Ulster during Elizabeth's reign, because she did not possess the power of enforcing her enactments against it there. O'Neill, O'Donnell, and the other chieftains either held the province against her lieutenants, or made such terms with them as secured comparative independence until the close of her reign, when they were subdued by Mountjoy. The queen, indeed, appointed her own bishops to various sees in Ulster, but they were merely titular, and could not secure the temporalities, a chief, if not the only object with them. No one can doubt that she had the will to abolish Catholicity in Ulster, as she had done in Munster, as far as penal laws could do it. The Northern chieftains knew this, and hence the first demand they made for her Commissioners in 1596, was "a general liberty of conscience;" a demand which is ridiculed by the English historian, Cox, who says:—"None of them had ever been persecuted or disturbed about religion."* No; they had not, and for the reason just given; it was not the want of will but the want of power, as is evidenced by occurrences in other parts of the country that prevented Elizabeth from persecuting them. Moreover, if the Queen's Commissioners had no intention of interfering with liberty of conscience, what was the meaning of refusing a condition that merely went to secure it?†

But Elizabeth did mean to destroy Catholicity in Ulster as she had, or hoped she had, destroyed it in Munster, for nothing was left undone by her to make the Irish nation protestant.

* Cox, p. 408, where he calls the conditions asked for by the Irish "unreasonable terms;" and where he further says the Irish were so "stiff" as to refuse going into Dundalk to meet the Commissioners. The old story of coaxing the Irish into their fortified towns; but on this occasion the Northern chiefs wisely insisted on meeting the Commissioners in the "open."

† "The cause they have to stand upon those terms, and to seek for better assurances, is the harsh practices *used against others* by those who have been placed in authority to protect men for your majestie's service, which they have greatly abused." *Captain Thomas Lee's Brief declaration to the Queen concerning abuses of her government in Ireland.* MSS. Trin. Col. Dub. Plowden, Vol. I. App. XII. "When upon the death of a great lord of a country, there hath been another nominated, chosen and created, he hath been entertained with fair speeches, taken down into his country, and so for the offences of other men, indictments have been framed against him, whereupon he hath been found guilty, and so lost his life." *Ibid.*

The complete extinction of the native race, and the replacing of them by English protestants was her design and determination; but she was not content to level one or two pieces of her reforming artillery at the devoted head of popery, the whole armoury of persecution was ransacked to find weapons for its annihilation. The people were exterminated in Munster, and were doomed to the same fate throughout the entire country, as opportunity might serve. The great chiefs were driven into rebellion, outlawed and plundered; and where their heirs could be got hold of, they were educated as protestants by the state; or else some member of the Chieftain's family was received into favour to be in due time, set up as a rival to the lawful heir. And this is what happened in the case of Hugh O'Neill.

Mr. Froude, who seems to hate Ireland and Catholicity with a morbid fanaticism, and who is not restrained by such feeble obstacles as facts, from endeavouring to overwhelm both with infamy, thus writes of Hugh O'Neill:—"In Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone, Elizabeth was now to find the most formidable Irish antagonist which either she or her predecessors had encountered. To her he was indebted for life, rank and fortune. He was the son of the Baron of Dungannon, whom Shane had murdered, and the grandson of the first Earl Con. Beyond doubt he would have shared his father's fate, had he not been sent to England, and thus taken care of. He was brought up at the Court as a Protestant, in the midst of the most brilliant circle which any capital in Europe could show. No pains were spared to make him a fit instrument for the reclamation of his country; and when of age, he received the patents of his grandfather's earldom, and returned to Ireland. The wolf which is treated as a dog remains a wolf still. O'Neill bound himself to permit neither monk nor priest within his jurisdiction who would not conform to the established religion.¹ He became himself a Catholic. ²He promised to introduce English law to abolish the Irish customs among his subjects, conform himself to English rule and order. He assumed the title of "The O'Neill" as the symbol of the Irish independent sovereignty, and he adopted the customs he had forsworn."*

The chief point put forward in the above passage is the scandalous ingratitude of Hugh O'Neill to his kind and almost

¹ Articles agreed on by the Earl of Tyrone, June 17, 1590. Calendar, Carew, MSS. p. 38. ² Ibid. p. 105. [These are Mr. Froude's references and are correct, so far as they are references.]

*The English in Ireland in the 18th century by James Anthony Froude, M.A., pp. 58-59.

affectionate patroness and protector, Queen Elizabeth. But her patronage and protection had nothing heroic or generous about them; they were on the contrary of a very selfish kind. Her reason for taking him up at all is plainly stated by her biographer and great eulogist, Camden, who says, under the year 1567:—"Hugh, commonly called Baron of Dungannon, who was the nephew of Shane (his father, Matthew being Shane's illegitimate brother), then; a despised youth, afterwards the disturber, nay the calamity of his country, *is received into Queen's favour, that she might have a rival to set up against Turloch Levinach*, should he fall away from his engagements."*

"He was brought up at the Court as a protestant," says Mr. Froude. Let us examine this off-hand assertion a little. That he appeared at Elizabeth's Court pretty early in life is certain, but that he was brought up there as a protestant or brought up there at all in the ordinary sense of the phrase is not only doubtful, but cannot have been the fact. That Elizabeth had the double object of making him a protestant and making him "a fit instrument for the reclamation of his country," according to Mr. Froude's notion of "reclamation," is clear enough; in which case the reclamation would mean the spoliation of the rightful owners of the soil, as happened in Munster, and the rooting out of the Catholic religion. The first recorded visit of Hugh O'Neill to England happened in 1567, when he and other Irish notables accompanied Sydney to that country, who went over to explain and defend his conduct in the government of Ireland. We cannot fix Hugh O'Neill's precise age at that time, but a fair estimate of what it was can be arrived at. He died at Rome, on the 20th of July, 1616, at which time he was, according to the Rev. C. P. Meehan, in his seventy-sixth year. But this age is only conjectural, being founded, Father Meehan assured me, on calculations made for him by the late learned Dr. O'Donovan, the translator and annotator of the *Four Masters*.† If this calculation be correct, Hugh O'Neill was born sometime in the year 1540, and would be in 1567 twenty-seven years of age. But even let us make a considerable deduction from the seventy-six years, and let us translate *juvenis* as we may, O'Neill must have had his religious opinions well formed before the Queen took him up as the rival of Turlough Luineach,

* Camden's *Eliz.* Ed. Batav. 1625, p. 130. "*Juvenis despectus*," the phrase in Camden is rendered "a young man then little *set by*" in the transl. printed in London in 1688: a phrase, according to the style of the time "in little esteem."

† The ages is given in p. 444 of "*The Fate and Fortunes of Hugh O'Neill and Rory O'Donnell*," by the Rev. C. P. Meehan. Unfortunately the papers containing the calculations above alluded to were destroyed.

and could not therefore be said to have been *brought up* at the Court of Elizabeth as a protestant.

To prove that Hugh O'Neill was a protestant when he returned from England, Mr. Froude quotes a condition agreed to by him in 1590, namely:—"That he maintain, not wittingly, in his country, any monk, friar, nun or priest that shall not conform themselves to the religion now established."* So far from this condition proving O'Neill to be a protestant at that time, it was evidently made by the Privy Council, as with a man they believed to be a Catholic and the favourer of priests and nuns. "He became himself a Catholic," says Mr. Froude. When? we may fairly ask. He was a protestant in 1590, according to Mr. Froude, and his becoming a Catholic is proved, he seems to think, by a passage in a document drawn up four years later, namely in 1594. At p. 105 of the Carew MSS. whence the above quotation is made, this passage occurs:—"If his purpose [i.e. O'Neill's] is to rebel, it must proceed either from a combination with Spain, (which may be suspected) as well in regard he is of the Romish Church, or else an ancient Irish practice to hinder the proceeding of English justice."† Surely this could not have been written of a man (and so important a man), who had been, as Mr. Froude asserts, a protestant three or four years previously. He would have been called a renegade, an apostate, or something of the kind; or at least it would have been said, "who is *now* of the Romish Church," or "who has lately conformed to the Romish Church." But no, it is simply set down as a well known accepted fact that "he is of the Romish Church." Indeed we learn from Captain Lee's "Brief Declaration to the Queen" that one of the accusations that O'Neill's enemies were in the habit of making against him in England was, that he was a papist, although somewhat of a lax one; for he attended protestant service when he happened to be with the Lord Deputy; which he did, it may be supposed, either through policy, or as a mark of respect to the Queen's representative. At any rate this fact is recorded in the following passage, as a proof of the liberality of the papist O'Neill:—"But your majesty is or shall be informed that he and his lady are papists, and foster seminaries, &c. True, it is, he is affected that way, but less hurtfully or dangerously than some

*Articles agreed to by the Earl of Tyrone before the Privy Council dated 17 June, 1590. Calendar Carew MSS. 1589-1600, p. 38, *ubi*. To "maintain not wittingly," is a very guarded phrase, and instead of quoting it, Mr. Froude paraphrases it as above. "O'Neill bound himself," &c., which differs from the original and is much stronger.

† "A Discourse for Ireland." Ibid. p. 105.

of the greatest in the English pale; for when he is with the State, he will accompany the Lord Deputy to the Church and home again, and will stay and hear service and sermon; they, as soon as they have brought the Lord Deputy to the door, depart, as if they were wild cats, and are obstinate; but he, (in my conscience) with good conference would be reformed; for he hath only one little cub of an English priest, by whom he is seduced for want of his friends' access to him, who might otherwise uphold him."* So that in 1594 Captain Lee expresses hopes of the conversion to protestantism of the man that Mr. Froude asserts was a protestant all his life, until he became a papist some short time before Captain Lee's "Brief Declaration to the Queen" was written. It is evident Captain Lee had no desire to bring O'Neill's Catholicity prominently before the queen; his business, as a kind of friend and apologist of O'Neill, was rather to minimize it, and keep it in the back ground as much as possible, which he does as well as he can; but it was too patent to be ignored.

Another proof that O'Neill did not become a protestant is, that he never lost his influence over the people of Ulster, which must have undoubtedly happened had he renounced the religion which they cherished and fought for. This view of the case receives a singular corroboration from the reception which the young Earl of Desmond met with from the people of Munster.

In 1579 three Spanish ships arrived at the coast of Kerry, with some soldiers, who landed at a place called Smerwick, where they fortified themselves. They were sent by the King of Spain to create a diversion in favour of his own arms in the Netherlands, his subjects there being in revolt against him, whom Elizabeth was aiding with men and money. They came also to aid the Catholics in resisting the persecution to which they were subjected, because they would not renounce their religion. They were under the guidance of James Fitzmaurice, one of the Geraldines; and the Earl of Desmond, without any sufficient cause, was suspected of favouring this attempt of his kinsman, for no matter what the Earl did or avoided doing, he was *suspected*. If he came within the power of the English, he was

* "Brief declaration to the queen concerning the abuses of her government in Ireland, by Captain Thomas Lee," written in 1594. MSS. Trin. Col. Dub. Appendix to Plowden, Vol. I. p. 36. The meaning of the last passage in the above quotation from Captain Lee is that all intercourse between O'Neill and his English friends had come to an end. The Lord Deputy had denounced him as a traitor, because he did not punish Maguire, who, together with O'Rourke was in open rebellion; whilst his father-in-law, and, at the same time, his most mortal enemy, Marshal Bagnal, was continually impeaching him at the Court of England.

made a prisoner ; if he refused to come, he was denounced as a traitor. Referring to the landing of the Spaniards, Cox says : " The Earl of Desmond continued his *profession of loyalty*, and pretended to act separately, but could not, by any means, venture himself in the camp, or in any walled town." Small blame to the Earl, who had already without a shadow of a cause, served an apprenticeship of imprisonment in the Tower of London. " However," continues Cox, "*he sent his only son* to be hostage of his fidelity, and the Countess brought the child to the Deputy a little before his death."* The account of the transaction given by the Four Masters differs somewhat from that of Cox. They say—the Lord Justice having pitched his camp in the neighbourhood of Kilmallock—" Hither the Earl of Desmond came to meet them ; and he endeavoured to impress it on their minds that he himself had no part in bringing over James the son of Maurice, or in any of the crimes committed by his relations ; and delivered up to the Lord Justice his only son and heir, as a hostage, to ensure his loyalty and fidelity to the Crown of England. A promise was thereupon given to the Earl that his territory should not be plundered in future ; but, although this promise was given, it was not kept, for his people and cattle were destroyed, and his corn and edifices."†

It was towards the end of the year 1579 that this child, the sole direct heir of the House of Desmond, was delivered up as a hostage to Sir William Drury, the Lord Justice, at Kilmallock. As fully twenty years passed between this event and the public appearance of the young Desmond in Ireland ; and as the annalists say he was seventeen years a prisoner in the tower, it would seem that he was kept in this country some two or three years after he had been consigned to the care of the Lord Justice, before he was sent to England. In England his education was committed to that famous historical personage, Miler Magrath, Archbishop of Cashel, that he might be brought up a protestant.‡

* Cox, vol. 1, p. 358.

† Annals of the Four Masters, 2nd Ed. p. 1777.

‡ Miler Magrath, "*homo non tam genere nobilis quam scelere clarus*," says O'Sullivan, [Cath. Hist.] was an Irishman, and a native of the County Fermanagh. At an early age he became a member of the Franciscan Order. He was appointed to the See of Down by Pope Pius the V., the temporalities of which he seems never to have enjoyed. Having apostatized at Drogheda on the 31st May, 1567, he was promoted to the See of Clogher by queen Elizabeth in 1570, but, as Ware informs us, received little or no profits from it. The Sees of Cashel and Emly becoming vacant the next year, he was appointed to the united dioceses. To them Lismore and Waterford were soon added ; but these were to be retained during the queen's pleasure only. After some years

After spending those seventeen dreary years of his young life in the hands of English jailors and Miler Magrath, it seemed to Cecil and Elizabeth that the time had come when he could be made use of to some advantage. The murder of his father in 1583 did not cause the Fitzgeralds to succumb, and they continued to give much trouble to the English in Munster; the O'Mores were in open rebellion in Leix, and O'Neill was dangerously formidable in Ulster. Carew, the new president of

he resigned Waterford and Lismore, but instead of them obtained Killala and Achonry. He was, moreover, made Vicar of Kilmacallan, rector of *Infra duos pontes* in Elphin, rector of Castleconnor and Skrine in Killala, Prebendary of Dougherne, and rector of Kilorhin in Achonry; thus holding in all, and at the same time, ten livings, four of them being bishoprics. What a pluralist indeed did not the lately girdled and sanded Franciscan monk become! No wonder that Ware says:—"he was a high favourite with queen Elizabeth." But the most amusing part of the whole business is, that he was a continual absentee from all his Sees and all his cures, living chiefly if not entirely about the English Court; so that the queen thought it necessary to excuse him to the Lord Deputy, which she did by telling him "that the Archbishop had been a long time at Court about the affairs of his Archbishoprick, and had been employed in her services to her contentation; she willed that no penalty be extended on him for his absence without licence." He governed the See of Cashel over 50 years, "during which time he made most scandalous wastes and alienations of the revenues and manors belonging to it." [Harris's Ware]. He was twice married. He died in the hundredth year of his age, having been bedridden during the last two years of his life. He built a tomb for himself in the Cathedral of Cashel, and wrote his own epitaph in Latin: a poor misty performance. The Catholics maintain that he was reconciled to the Catholic Church before his death, an assertion which protestant writers deny. What is certain in the matter is, that, about ten years before he died he sent a communication to the Provincial of the Irish Franciscans about his desire of returning to the Catholic Church, which caused the Provincial to repair to Cashel, where he had an interview with him, and by his directions wrote to the Papal Nuncio at Brussels. The Nuncio wrote a kind conciliatory reply, which is given by Brennan [Eccl. Hist., vol. 2, p. 106]. Whether Miler ever carried out his intention or not there is no direct proof. Tradition says he did, but the general ways of Divine Providence are against the supposition. He went, or was sent to O'Rourke, Prince of Breifne, a little before his execution at Tyburne in 1591 "to counsell him for his soule's health," but O'Rourke rejected his ministrations with scorn, and rebuked him for his apostasy. He was one of the Commissioners sent to make peace with O'Neill and O'Donnell in 1596. O'Sullivan [Hist. Cath.] says he did not search after priests, nor try to seduce Catholics from their religion. See Harris's Ware, under "Cashel," Brennan's Ecclesiastical History, O'Sullivan's Cath. History, The Four Masters, &c. The following curious entry is found in the Calendar of the Patent Roll of James 1st's reign, p. 201. "King's letter to Will. Knight to be coadjutor to the archbishop of Cashel, and to be allotted for his expenses the profits arising from the jurisdiction which the said archbishop's son *who is a recusant*, now enjoys—also for a grant of the said archbishoprick of Cashel when vacant to the said Will Knight, 25th Sept., 8th of James I. So that Miler Magrath's son was a recusant and yet held "jurisdiction" in the protestant church! This Will Knight appointed to be the future archbishop of Cashel was no better than he ought to be. He never succeeded to that dignity, because says Archbishop King "Knight had appeared drunk in public and thereby exposed himself to the scorn and derision of the people." Harris's Ware's Bishops, p. 434.

Munster, felt, and the English privy Council agreed with him, that an important blow could be struck in favour of English interests by sending over the young Earl of Desmond, whose presence in Ireland they hoped "would draw the ancient followers of the Earl of Desmond [his father] from James FitzThomas, the supposed Earl."* Elizabeth released the youthful James Fitzgerald from his duress of seventeen years, admitted him to her presence, styled him Earl of Desmond, and sent him into Ireland attended by a certain Captain Price, who was to be a spy on all his movements. He was also accompanied by his religious tutor Miler Magrath. But although the queen, with diplomatic courtesy, addressed him as Earl of Desmond, the title was given to him only conditionally. The patent, indeed, was made out, but it was to remain in the Lord President's hands until he was assured, that the bringing of the Young Earl into Munster would have the success the queen expected from it. If not, all "the extraordinarie clemencie" she had shown was to be recalled.†

The young Earl's visit turned out to be a most conspicuous failure, although great pains were taken to make it a success. His coming was carefully reported far and wide beforehand; a servant wearing the Desmond livery having been through the country with the great tidings. When expectation was fully aroused, he landed at Youghal, in October, 1600. "When he came to Cork," says Cox, "the inhabitants, finding he was a protestant, refused to entertain him, so that he was fain to obtrude upon the Mayor."

The account of his reception at Kilmallock I give from the *Pacata Hibernia*, because it is the fullest and because it is written from the English stand-point. It is as follows:—"It was thought by all men, that the coming of this young Lord into Ireland would have bred a great alteration in the Province, and absolute revolt of all the old followers of the House of Desmond from James Fitzthomas, but it proved of no such consequence; for the President, to make trial of the disposition and affection of the young Earl's kindred and followers, at his desire, consented that he should make a journey from Moyalls into the county of Limerick, accompanied with the Archbishop of Cashel, and Master Boyle, Clerk of the Council (a person whom the Lord President did repose much trust and confidence in, and with whom he then communicated and advised about his most secret and

* *Pacata Hibernia*, Book I., chap. 14.

† *Ibid.* The Lord President was permitted to show the patent restoring the Earldom, but he was not to let it out of his hands.

serious affairs of that government); and to Master Boyle his Lordship gave secret charge, as well to observe the Earl's ways and carriage, as what men of quality or others made their address unto him; and with what respects and behaviour they carried themselves towards the Earl; who came to Kilmallock upon a Saturday, in the evening, and by the way, and at their entry into the town, there was a mighty concourse of people, in so much as all the streets, doors, and windows, yea, the very gutters and tops of the houses were filled with them, as if they came to see him, whom God had sent to be that comfort and delight, their souls and hearts most desired, and they welcomed him with all the expressions and signs of joy, everyone throwing upon him wheat and salt (an ancient ceremony used in that province upon the election of their new mayors and officers as a prediction of their future peace and plenty).^{*} That night the Earl was invited to supper to Sir George Thornton's who then kept his house in the town of Kilmallock; and although the Earl had a guard of soldiers, which made a lane from his house to Sir George Thornton's house, yet the confluence of people that flocked thither to see him was so great, as in half an hour he could not make his passage through the crowd; and after supper he had the like encounters at his return to his lodging. The next day being Sunday, the Earl went to church to hear divine service and all the way his country people used loud and rude dehortations to keep him from church, unto which he lent a deaf ear; but after service and the sermon was ended, the Earl coming forth of the church, was railed at, and spat upon by those that before his going to church were so desirous to see and salute him; in so much, as after that public expression of his religion, the town was cleared of that multitude of strangers, and the Earl, from thenceforward might walk as quietly and freely in the town, as little in effect followed or regarded as any other private gentleman. This true relation I the rather make that all men may observe how hateful our religion and the professors thereof are to the ruder and ignorant sort of people in that Kingdom: for, from thenceforward none of his fathers' followers, (except some few of the meaner sort of freeholders) resorted unto him; and the other great Lords in Munster, who had evermore been overshadowed by the greatness of Desmond, did rather fear than wish the advancement of the young lord; but the truth is, his religion, being

^{*} Probably as a token of welcome also. A curious coincidence is, that when the Czar, Alexander, arrived in Moscow on 2nd Decr. 1879, after having escaped being blown up on his journey, the municipality of the city presented him with bread and salt. The ceremony did not appear to have any connection with his escape, it seems rather to be an expression of fealty and welcome.

a protestant, was the only cause that had bred this coyness in them all: for if he had been a Romish Catholic, the hearts and knees of all degrees in the Province would have bowed unto him.”*

Had Hugh O'Neill been a protestant he would have received the same treatment from his Ulster followers; and furthermore, no better answer than the above can be given to those writers who pretend that at this time the Irish were steeped in ignorance, and that they followed their chieftains not through any principle, but through a blind and slavish obedience.

It is a tradition embalmed in the history of Ireland and in the hearts of its people, that the Geraldines were more Irish than the Irish themselves, but to this should be added that they were as Catholic as they were Irish. Was it not then a sad spectacle to see the heir of Desmond hooted and spat upon to-day by those who would have died for him yesterday? The poor youth was not to blame; when given as a hostage by his parents he was a mere child, being about seven years old; so he was robbed of his faith and the faith of his fathers, who were the trusted and unswerving champions of that faith, before he had years enough to judge for himself.†

Having failed to fulfil the queen's expectations, she, according to O'Daly, “began to think little about him, and he immediately embarked for England, where he soon afterwards died, according to some, by poison.”

* *Pacata Hibernia*, Vol. 1, p. 163. Dublin Ed. 1810. The Master Boyle spoken of above afterwards became Earl of Cork.

† Take the following as a specimen of a Geraldine's Catholicity:—“The queen growing weary of the contest, sent him [the father of the young Earl] offers of peace, nay, and promised to restore him to all his possessions and honors, provided he delivered into her hands Dr. Sanders, the nuncio from Pope Gregory XIII, who, being an Englishman might be said to be her own born subject. To those who brought that message the pious earl replied, that he would never sacrifice the priest, although his enemies were hourly multiplying around him. ‘Tell the queen,’ said he, ‘that though my friends should desert my standard, and a price be set on my head, for refusing to do her bidding in this instance, I will never give her possession of this man's person.’” “Lord Ormond was the bearer of the queen's offer and demand for the person of Dr. Sanders, and the earl's refusal was immediately followed by a proclamation of outlawry against himself and his followers.”—*O'Daly's Geraldines Earls of Desmond*: translated by Rev. C. P. Meehan, C.C., M.R.I.A., pp. 107-8, 2 Ed.

CHAPTER III.

THE laws made in Elizabeth's first Irish Parliament, of which some account is given at p. 7, were put in force without delay, and whenever they seemed too slow or too merciful the queen's officers had no difficulty in acting beyond them, or interpreting them in such a manner as to justify whatever they did. The oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy were commonly tendered as one *Oath*, so that whosoever refused this composite Oath could be accused as a traitor, a rebel, or a recusant. During the queen's reign this system produced a large number of martyrs in Ireland, amounting, as I have found by careful examination, to about two HUNDRED, besides very many confessors who suffered tortures of the most barbarous kind, together with various terms of imprisonment, usually in the most loathsome and filthy dungeons. The vast majority of those martyrs were priests, who, in the very jaws of death kept the sacred fire of divine faith alive: many heroic laymen suffered also, and amongst the bright intrepid band there are to be found no less than *fourteen* bishops. Some of the punishments were unique in their ingenious wickedness, in the midst of which the burning and holy eloquence of many of the martyrs was not unworthy of the days of the Catacombs and the Colliseum. Some of the martyrs were seized whilst giving the last consolations of religion to the dying; some were dragged from the altar while offering the Holy Sacrifice, whilst many were slain in the Sanctuary itself. Some were cast from lofty towers, others were fastened to mill wheels and so mangled to death. On one occasion forty-two priests were put on board a vessel, under pretence of permitting them to leave the Kingdom, but when out some distance to sea they were all thrown overboard, after which the vessel returned to the port she had but just quitted.* Some were hung from trees with the cinctures of their religious habits.

The Right Rev. Patrick O'Haly, a Franciscan, having been appointed bishop of Mayo, came to Ireland, accompanied by a priest of his order, the Rev. Cornelius O'Rourke, eldest son of the Prince of Breifne, who had resigned his claim to the principality to become a priest. They were soon arrested by the spies who were set by the government to watch and examine all

* Hib. Dom. p. 595.

suspicious strangers who landed in the country. They were immediately cast into prison, and after some time brought before Drury, the Lord Deputy, at Kilmallock in 1578. Being interrogated by him, they confessed their position and calling, and the business which brought them to Ireland; Dr. O'Haly boldly declaring that he was bishop of Mayo, and had been sent by Pope Gregory the 13th, to guide and instruct the flock thus committed to him. "And do you dare," asked Drury, "to defend the authority of the Pope against the laws of the queen and parliament?" "I repeat what I have said," replied the bishop, and I am ready, if necessary, to die for that sacred truth." Father O'Rourke replied in a similar manner. They were sentenced to be first tortured and then hanged in presence of the garrison. In accordance with this sentence they were put upon the rack; their bones were broken with hammers; and needles were thrust under the nails. Having been tortured in this manner they were hanged upon a tree, where their bodies were left suspended during fourteen days as targets for the bullet practice of the soldiers.* As they were led to execution the bishop warned Drury that before many days he should appear before God to answer for his crimes. Fourteen days afterwards he died at Waterford in great agony. It is said that the Countess of Desmond betrayed the martyrs to their enemies. When the bishop and his companion arrived in Ireland, they sought out the Earl of Desmond, but he was unfortunately absent; the Countess, however, received them hospitably, but after some days, as is asserted by some, betrayed them into the hands of the Lord Deputy.† She was a Butler, being the daughter of Lord Dunboyne.‡

The slaughter perpetrated about this time (Nov. 12, 1580) in the Goldenfort at Smerwick was dreadful in its every detail. Father Laurence Moore, Oliver Plunket, an Irish gentleman and a soldier, and William Walsh (called Willick in the Vatican MS.), an Englishman and also a soldier, were in the fort when it was surrendered by the Spanish commander, Don Jose, to the

*"Corpus, vero, Episcopi per multos dies in ligno pendens, cum sæpius milites hæretici, recreationis causâ, ab oppido exirent, ad sanctum illud corpus tanquam ad certam metam, seu scopum, scopetis illudebant blasphemantes Deum et dicentes, 'ego percutiam Papæ Episcopum in capite;' alius dicit, 'ego in pede,' alius 'in manu,' etc.; Ita Christi servus et vivus et mortuus injuria est affectus ab hæreticis anno 1579 regnante pro rege." *Irish Martyrs during the reign of Elizabeth*, by Father John Holing, S.J., quoted in *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, Vol. 1, p. 83.

† Bouchier, p. 167 et seq. quoted by Lenihan in his *History of Limerick*, pp. 104-7.

‡ Unpublished Geraldine Documents, part 2, p. 70.

Lord Deputy Grey. The garrison gave up their arms (upon conditions, it is asserted), and no sooner had they done so than they, to the number of about seven hundred, were massacred by English soldiers told off for that bloody and murderous service.* Father Moore and his two companions had been previously placed in the hands of the Lord Deputy, who reserved them for special punishment. The usual inducements were held out to them, if they would only acknowledge the queen as head of the church; to which temptation they answered that they were Catholics, and that in the profession and defence of the Catholic Faith they would persevere till death. They were led off to the forge of an iron smith, where their arms and legs were broken in three different parts; the priest was subjected to the additional punishment of having his thumbs and forefingers cut off, because, as his executioners alleged, they had been so often employed in consecration of the Eucharist and had touched it.† During all that night and the following day, they bore their torments with invincible patience; finally they were hanged and their bodies cut into fragments. They received their crowns on St. Martin's day, 1580.‡

In the same year Father Daniel O'Nielan, a priest of the diocese of Cloyne, was suspended by a rope from Trinity Tower in Youghal. His executioners having made the rope fast at the top of the tower swung him out from the battlements, not for the purpose of taking away his life, but to give him a shock, hoping, probably, to get some revelations from him. His weight broke the rope, and he fell to the ground, where, on descending from the Tower his torturers found him mangled and almost lifeless. Seeing that he was not quite dead, they had him tied to the waterwheel of a neighbouring mill, which, in its evolutions, soon tore him to pieces.

Concerning the martyrdom of Most Rev. Dr. Dermot O'Hurley, the great Archbishop of Cashel, very full accounts have come down to us. He was born in the diocese of Limerick, and having passed with much distinction through all the

* "The deputy, Lord Grey de Wilton had taken Limerick, and against the capitulation, put to death the whole garrison."—*Earls of Kildare*, by the Marquis of Kildare, 2 Ed. p. 214.

† "Sacerdotique pollicibus ac indicibus abscissis, eò quod sæpissime Eucharistiæ Sacramentum consecrasset, iisque illud tetigisset." "*Irish Martyrs* during the reign of Elizabeth, by Father John Holing, S.J." *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, Vol. 1, p. 88.

‡ See O'Reilly's sufferings for the Catholic Faith; *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, by Right Rev. Dr. Moran; *Haverty's Ireland* p. 424, note, &c. Such different accounts of this carnage are given by various English officers that no reliance can be placed on any of them.

branches of a liberal education at Louvain and Paris, he was honoured with the degree of doctor in Civil and Canon Law. He was appointed to the See of Cashel in a consistory held on the 3rd of September, 1580, in the pontificate of Pope Gregory the XIII. As soon as convenient after his consecration, he took shipping at some port in the north of France, probably Cherbourg, whence he sailed for Ireland. At the port of embarkation he met with some other Irish ecclesiastics who accompanied him on the voyage.* He was beset by dangers on every side—from the master of the ship—from the sailors—from spies, informers, and government officials at the place of landing; so that he could justly apply to himself the words of the great apostle of the Gentiles:—"In journeying often he was in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils from his own nation, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils from false brethren."† De Rothe says he landed at Skerries; the state papers say it was at Drogheda. It is of no consequence to the history, at which place he landed, but De Rothe is probably right. Skerries lies about half way between Dublin and Drogheda, and would be likely to be chosen for a landing place, being a very quiet little port. There is a small island opposite Skerries, only a short distance out to sea—Holm-Patrick,—on which it would be prudent for them to land in the first instance, in order to reconnoitre the state of things on shore. After landing Dr. O'Hurley would be likely to proceed in the direction of Drogheda, rather than of Dublin, (1) because by doing so he would avoid the dangers of the capital; and (2) as the priests who sailed with him were going to Newry, he would be likely to travel, at least for a while, in that direction with them. After his arrest the authorities could trace him to Drogheda and no further, and that being a good sea-port, they would naturally assume that it was there he landed. He proceeded, evidently from Drogheda, to Slane Castle, the residence of Thomas Fleming, Baron of Slane, where he was discovered by Robert Dillon, then Chief Justice of the Commons Pleas; who, on the occasion of a visit to the Castle, engaged him in conversation, and concluded from the superior learning which he showed, that he was some important person in disguise. Some circumstances occurred which alarmed the Archbishop and he fled from Slane Castle; meantime, the Chief Justice laid his suspicions before the Council in Dublin; the Baron of Slane was summoned before

* See Poem on his Consecration in *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, p. 80.

† II Cor. xi. v. 26.

that tribunal, severely reprimanded, and told to produce his guest without delay. "Being tepid in faith, and bound up with the world he shrunk from what seemed destruction;" so he "hotly" pursued the Archbishop; overtook him at Carrick-on-Suir, and brought him back to Dublin, where he was tortured with the most fiendish cruelty.*

"The executioners placed the Archbishop's feet and legs in tin boots filled with oil; they then fastened his feet in wooden shackles or stocks, and placed fire under them. The boiling oil so penetrated the feet and legs that morsels of the skin and even flesh fell off and left the bone bare."† This was for the purpose of compelling him to deny his faith and turn informer; but they did not consider the punishment sufficient for their purpose, although "the officer whose duty it was to preside over the torture, unused to such unheard of suffering, and unable to look on such an inhuman spectacle, or to bear the piteous moans of the innocent prelate, suddenly left his seat and quitted the place"‡ In a letter addressed to Sir Francis Walsingham, principal Secretary of State to the Queen, they complain that they cannot so terrify him as to make him "tell the truth;" adding, "We want either rack or other engine of torture to terrify him." They, therefore, request that "the said Hurley may be sent over to the Tower, and herein crave answer with speed."§ The reason, then, for desiring to have the Archbishop sent to the Tower was, because they had in Ireland no instruments of torture powerful enough to shake his constancy, whilst the Tower, as they well knew, was the very arsenal of such instruments. For some reason this request was not complied with, and the non-compliance with it threw difficulties in the way of the Irish authorities, inasmuch as the ordinary mode of proceeding might be tedious, and even uncertain, as the law in Ireland differed from the law in England with regard to "treasons committed in foreign parts;" and as the two Lords Justices, Adam Loftus and H. Wallop, were about to resign their office, to make room for Sir John Perrott, who had already arrived; and, further, as it was rumoured that the Earl of Ormond was on his way to Dublin to intercede for the Archbishop.|| The Lords Justices, therefore, thought it prudent to despatch O'Hurley before they had

* De Rothe.

† Stainhurst, quoted by M. O'Reilly, p. 65.

‡ Ibid. pp. 29-30.

§ State Papers, Ireland, No. 7, 1583, Decr. 10th, quoted by M. O'Reilly.

|| Ormonde was on the most friendly terms with Perrott, and had accompanied him from Milford Haven to Ireland, when he was coming over as Lord Deputy. See *Perrott's Life*, p. 140.

laid down their authority. Besides they had taken time by the forelock, and had applied for permission to have him tried by martial law; which request was graciously conceded in the following terms:—"In case you shall find the effect of his causes doubtful by reason of the affections of such as shall be his jury, and for the supposal conceived by the lawyers of that country that he can hardly be found guilty for his treason committed in foreign parts against her Majesty, then her pleasure is you take a shorter way with him by martial law. So as you may see it is referred to your discretion whether of these two ways your Lordships will take with him; and the man being so resolute to reveal no more matter, it is thought meet to have no further tortures used against him, but that you proceed forthwith to his execution in manner aforesaid. As for her Majesty's good acceptance of your careful travail in this matter of Hurley, you need nothing to doubt, and, for your better assurance thereof, she has commanded me to let your Lordships understand that, as well in all other the like as in this case of Hurley, she cannot but greatly allow and commend your doings."*

As Perrott was to receive the sword of office on Trinity Sunday, the Archbishop was executed on the previous Friday. Very early on the morning of that day he was taken out of the castle by a private door, Sir H. Wallop himself (it is said) leading the way accompanied by a few guards only. He was hanged in a wood near the city, and buried in the half ruined church of St. Kevin, where it is stated many miracles were wrought, in consequence of which the old church was restored and very much frequented by the people.†

Among the distinguished victims of Elizabeth's reign was Brian-na-Murtha O'Rourke, Prince of Breifney. When the Spanish Armada was defeated and dispersed, it happened that

* Public Record Office, London. State Papers Vol. CIX., No. 66, 1584, April 28. Quoted by M. O'Reilly in "Martyrs and Confessors in the reign of Elizabeth," p. 83.

† St. Kevin's Church was due south of the Castle. In the Catholic division the parish was long united to that of St. Nicholas Without, otherwise Francis Street. When Most Rev. Dr. McCabe, the late Abp. of Dublin was parish priest of St. Nicholas Without, he commenced the building of a church in this district, which has, for a considerable time been completed, and St. Kevin's is once again a distinct church.

The Rev. M. O'Kelly, in his edition of O'Sullivan's Catholic History, gives the following foot note at p. 126:—"Martyred on Stephen's Green, and buried in the old churchyard of St. Kevin:" *Analecta* ii. p. 71; also Mooney, who says (p. 69) that it was in May. The Rt. Rev. Dr. (now Cardinal) Moran says his episcopate was crowned with martyrdom on 20th June, 1584. *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, p. 80. As the execution was private it is probable it did not take place in Stephen's Green, but somewhere near it. St. Kevin's churchyard is only the length of a moderately sized street from Stephen's Green.

three ships, belonging to that supposed invincible fleet, foundered in Sligo Bay, the crews of which were of course in the most helpless condition, being without food or necessaries of any kind. O'Rourke's Castle of Dromahaire was some eight or nine miles inland, standing on the Boonid river at the head of Loughgill, to which he had about three hundred of the miserable creatures conveyed. This fact having reached the Lord Deputy's ears, he summoned O'Rourke to give up the Spaniards to him, as prisoners. O'Rourke replied that neither his honour nor his religion allowed him to surrender Catholics who had implored his protection. For greater security he sent the Spaniards to his friend MacSwiney *na Tuath*, who had already given hospitality to Antonio de Leva, one of the commanders of the Armada, and a large number of his comrades. In order to punish O'Rourke for resisting their demand, the Lord Deputy and Bingham, Governor of Connaught, marched against him with a strong force, composed of English and Irish soldiers; among the latter being Ulick Burke, Earl of Clanrickard and his people. O'Rourke's chief strength consisted in about two hundred mercenaries who had been in the service of the Earl of Desmond previous to his death, in addition to whom he hastily assembled about the same number of his own people. Bingham marched on Dromahaire, and overcame O'Rourke's small and ill-disciplined army. Being thus vanquished he made his way to MacSwiney to whom he had previously sent the Spaniards. With MacSwiney he remained upwards of a year,* after which he went to Scotland, hoping to obtain aid from James the 6th then reigning, who had for a long time kept up an active correspondence with the Irish chieftains, because he well knew they were thoroughly devoted to his mother's interests, and because their resistance to Elizabeth was favourable to his views. James had just made peace with Elizabeth, and being glad of an opportunity to pay her a compliment, he sent her the Prince of Breifney in chains.

"Bryan O'Rourke the Irish potentate, being thus, by the king of the Scots sent into England, was arraigned in Westminster Hall: his indictments were, that he had stirred Alexander M'Connell and others; had scornfully dragged the Queen's picture at a horse-taile and discut the same to peeces; giving the Spaniards entertainment against a proclamation; fier'd many houses, &c. This being told him by an interpreter (for he understood no English), he said he would not submit himself to a tryall of twelve men, nor make answer, except the Queen satt in person to judge him. The Lord Chief Justice made answer againe by an

* *Four Masters.* This MacSwiney was Owen Oge.

interpreter, that whether he would submit himself or not to a tryall by a jury of twelve, he should be judged by law, according to the particulars alledjed against him. Whereto he replied nothing, but 'if it must be so, let it be so.' Being condemned to die, he was shortly after carried unto Tyburne, to be executed as a traitor, whereat he seemed to be nothing moved, scorning the Archbishop of Caishill (Miler Magrath), who was there to counsell him for his soul's health, because he had broken his vow, from a Franciscan turning Protestant.* He gravely petitioned the Queen, not for life or pardon, but that he might be hanged with a gad, or withe, after his own country fashion, which doubtless was readily granted to him.† Being brought before the Privy Council he maintained his usual haughty bearing, whereupon one of them asked him 'why he did not bend the knee,' on coming into their presence: he answered that 'he was not accustomed to do so.' His interrogator then said 'are you not in the habit of bending your knee before images?' 'Certainly,' replied O'Rourke. 'Why, then,' continued the Privy Councillor, 'do you not do the same thing now?' 'Because,' said O'Rourke, 'I always believed that the difference between God and his saints (whose images I venerate), and you is very great indeed.'‡

Towards the end of this reign, the English, some writers say, ceased to persecute the Irish Catholics as actively as they had done in the earlier years of Elizabeth's reign; they even tolerated, or at least connived at the saying of Mass, and the administration of the Sacraments by the priests; but this they did as a policy, and on the advice of "the wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind"—Francis Bacon, afterwards Lord High Chancellor of England. He suggested to his patron, Essex, two helps (principles the wicked suggestions cannot be called) towards the governing of Ireland: (1) Toleration of Popery for a time *not definite*; (2) The weakening of the people, by disunion among themselves. Both means were put in force; but when Mountjoy had succeeded in reducing Ulster, James the 1st soon defined the length of the toleration by putting an end to it: the second means—the fomenting of division amongst the Irish themselves—has been used ever since with marked success.§

Dr. Charles O'Connor, who was the ninth in descent from this

* MS. History of Ireland preserved in the Library of the Royal Irish Academy, p. 452.

† Lord Bacon's *Essays*, quoted by Cox and also by Dr. O'Donovan in note Vol. 6, p. 1906. *Four Masters*.

‡ Dr. O'Donovan and others say it was to the Queen O'Rourke refused to bow.

§ "There is no doubt but to wrestle with them now is indirectly opposite to their reclaim, and cannot but continue their alienation of mind from their go-

Brian O'Rourke, says, the only crime which O'Rourke could be accused of was, his having received under his roof some shipwrecked Spaniards; men whom the most hardened barbarity would scarcely consider as enemies. A little before his execution, Miler Magrath, appointed Archbishop of Cashel, was sent to him, to prevail on him to conform. "No," said O'Rourke, "but do you remember the dignity from which you have fallen: return into the bosom of the ancient Church, and learn from my fortitude that lesson, which you ought to have been the last on earth to disavow."*

vernment. Besides one of the principal pretences whereby the heads of the rebellion have prevailed both with the people and the foreigner, hath been the defence of the Catholique religion; and it is that likewise hath made the foreigner reciprocally more plausible with the rebel. Therefore a toleration of religion *for a time not definite*, except it be in some principal town and precincts, after the manner of some French edicts, seemeth to me to be a matter warrantable by religion, and in policie of absolute necessity; and the hesitation of this, I think, hath been a great casting back of the affairs there" [in Ireland]. Previously Bacon had suggested for this country what he calls "the princely policy," which was to weaken by division and dissension of the Heads. See *Letter to Essex* Cabala 1591, p. 21, and *Conversations touching the Queen's service in Ireland* enclosed in a letter to Cecil after the defeat of the Spaniards at Limerick, Ib. p. 49. No date.

* *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Charles O'Connor of Belanagare*, p. 112, quoted by Dr. O'Donovan.

CHAPTER IV.

WHEN James the 1st succeeded to Elizabeth in 1603, the Catholics expected a relaxation of the penal statutes passed against them during the reign of that princess, and plainly framed, not merely to punish and beggar, but to annihilate them. They had good reasons for expecting clemency from James, as before his accession to the throne of England he kept up a secret correspondence with Spain, and even with the Pope. Moreover, during the reign of Elizabeth, "he assisted the Irish privately more than Spain did publicly."* He may have had a desire to befriend the Catholics on account of their devotion to his mother, but being a Stuart, he had no notion of making sacrifices or undertaking risks for his friends ; so he played off party against party, giving to each soft words by turns ; his only real principle seeming to be that, whatsoever creed might be uppermost, he was determined to be King of England. At the beginning of his reign the Catholics certainly became importunate in asking concessions ; but instead of granting their requests he revived the penal laws against them, and made new ones severer than those of Elizabeth.

The principal leaders of Catholic deputations that waited on him he sent to the Tower ; and he ignominiously dismissed the remainder. He issued a proclamation commanding all priests to leave Ireland on pain of death, and enforced the laws for compelling Catholics to attend the protestant services by the double penalty of fine and imprisonment. Their absence had been punished only by fine in Elizabeth's reign. The imprisonment which James inflicted was perfectly illegal.

Notwithstanding the efforts put forth during Elizabeth's reign to abolish Catholicity in Ireland, no impression worth speaking of had been made upon it. A few, through fear, and some to save their property, outwardly conformed, and were called church-papists, but even these continued to give support and countenance to the priests. This is made very manifest by a letter of the protestant bishop of Cork, Cloyne and Ross to the Lord Deputy, giving an account of the state of his diocese. He says:—"An English minister must needs be beholden to the Irishry ; his neighbours love him not, especially his profession and doctrine, they being compelled to hear him." But what most grieved the Bishop was

* Dr. Anderson's Royal Genealogies, p. 786.

the encouragement given by the conforming lords and gentlemen to priests and friars. He mentioned the name of several who live under the protection of Lord Barry of Buttevant, adding:—"These Sir John countenances openly at his own table. . . . commending them to the world and applauding their profession, and manner of life. They be sturdy fellows, well fed and warm."* Again:—"Besides these friars every gentleman and lord of the country hath his priests, and at these abbeys they usually meet. Every friar and priest is called father, yea, talk with the Lord Barry, the Lord Roche, or any man, no other name but Father; Father such a one; Father such a one. So are they bewitched and blinded. . . . Massing is in every place; idolatry is publicly maintained; God's word and his truth is trodden down under foot, despised, railed at, and contemned of all; the ministers not esteemed—no, not with them that should reverence and countenance them. The professors of the Gospel may learn of these idolaters to regard their pastors."† In June, 1604, John Horsfall, Bishop of Ossory, gives a return to the Deputy and Council of the names of the priests, thirty in number, then in the diocese of Ossory, whom the people obeyed and followed, despising and scorning the censures of the protestant church; and that the Council might better imagine the truth of his report, he encloses a catalogue "which shows how many Romish caterpillars, abiding in his diocese prevent the hope of the Lord's harvest."‡ And that most devoted servant of the King, Justice Saxey, reports that the Jesuits, seminaries [sic] and priests, "swarm as locusts throughout the whole kingdom, and are harboured and maintained by the noblemen and chief gentry of the country, but especially by the cities and walled towns, massing and frequenting all the superstitions of the people in their obstinate errors, and their contempt of the religion of God, and His Majesty's ecclesiastical law."§

Up to this time the Irish parliament had passed no law for the banishment of priests, but Justice Saxey in his zeal, held the statute of the 27th of Elizabeth, for banishing them from the queen's dominions, was of force in Ireland. Such a view had never been put forward before: it was unsound and could not be constitutionally maintained. Several years after in 1620-21, a much greater lawyer, Sir John Davys, laid down the correct

* Preface to Calendar of State Papers of James 1st's reign 1606 to 1608, p. lxx.

† Ibid. Calendar, vol. II., p. 133.

‡ Ibid. pp. lviii-ix.

§ Ibid. lix-lx.

principle in the English House of Commons, when he said :—" It is expressly in the law books set down that Ireland is a member of the Crown of England ; yet this kingdom here cannot make laws to bind that kingdom ; for they have there a parliament of their own."* It was bad enough for James to overstep the constitution of this kingdom by his proclamation of 1605, but it was utterly intolerable for one of his subordinates, Brouncker, Lord President of Munster, to have done so, nearly a year before the King's Proclamation appeared. On the 14th of August, 1604, Sir Henry Brouncker, with the Council of Munster, issued a " proclamation banishing all Jesuits, seminaries and massing priests out of all the corporate towns in the province, by the 30th September following ; and offered a reward of £40 for every Jesuit, £6 8s. 4d. for every seminary, and £5 for every massing priest that should be brought to him."†

The King's Proclamation for the banishment of the priests bears date 4th of July, 1605. In it he complained that his subjects in Ireland had been much abused by a report that he purposed giving liberty of conscience or toleration of religion to his subjects in that kingdom, contrary to the statutes therein enacted, and to the uniformity of religion then existing in his other dominions. He therefore thought it meet, says the Proclamation, " to declare and publish to all his loving subjects of Ireland his high displeasure with the report, and his resolve never to do any act that may confirm the hopes of any creature that they shall ever have from him any toleration to exercise any other religion than that which is agreeable to God's word, and established by the laws of the realm." And as he had been informed that a great number of seminary priests, Jesuits and other priests range up and down the kingdom, seducing the people to their superstitious ceremonies, " he declares, publishes and proclaims, that it is his will and commandment that all Jesuits, seminary priests, or other priests whatsoever, made and ordained by any authority derived or pretended to be derived from the See of Rome, shall, the 10th day of December next, depart out of the kingdom of Ireland. And that no Jesuit, seminary priest, or other priest ordained by foreign authority, shall from and after the 10th of December, repair or return into that kingdom, upon pain of his high displeasure, and upon such further pain and penalty as may be justly inflicted upon them by the laws and statutes of that realm. And upon the like pain he expressly forbids all his subjects

* Life of Sir John Davys, p. xxx, preface to the Dublin Edition of his *Historical Tracts*, published in 1787.

† Calendar, Vol. 1, p. 190. Preface lxxiv, Ibid. lxi.

within that kingdom, to receive or relieve any such Jesuit, seminary priest, or other priest, who after the said 10th day of December, shall remain in that realm or return to the same or any part thereof."*

This Proclamation, sweeping as it was, had by no means the full effect intended, for Sir John Davys, in his account of a journey made by him in Munster in 1606, gives the names of many priests he knew to reside in Cork, Clonmel, Limerick, Waterford and other places. He adds:—"If your bishops and others that have care of souls were but half as diligent in their several charges as these men are in the places where they haunt, the public would not receive and nourish them as now they do."

The priests were equally harboured in the Irish districts and in the Pale.

The flight of Tyrone and Tyrconnell in 1607, so far from depressing the Catholics, raised their hopes and expectations of foreign succour. Many of the clergy in exile appear to have entertained the same views, and began to return to Ireland. The Lord Deputy, writing to the English Council a few weeks after the departure of the Earls, says that priests and Jesuits had flocked into the kingdom in greater numbers than at any previous time, so that it was now a common taunt of the Irish, that they "had more priests in the country than the king had soldiers." Irish women have been always renowned for their virtue, but those who know them intimately, know that their faith is equal to their virtue, and to this faith the Deputy unwittingly pays a high compliment when he says:—"They [the priests] have so gained the women that they are in a manner all of them absolute recusants. Children and servants are wholly taught and catechised by them [the priests], esteeming the same (as in truth it is) a sound and sure foundation of their synagogue." And Brouncker in a paper written by him "Concerning Reformation of Religion in Ireland," corroborates and strengthens this view. He says:—"Those that live in the country do daily see that they are all maligned and deadly hated as devils and hell hounds, if they come once to church, and their Catholic wives will neither eat nor live with their husbands if they be excommunicated for heretics, as presently they are by the priests if they come to the Protestant service."†

The fines imposed for absence from the Protestant service may appear trivial at the present time, but as explained elsewhere

* Calendar, Vol. I, p. 302. Preface lxi. Ibid. p. lxiii. More than a year before [in Feb. 1604] he had published a similar Proclamation in England.

† Calendar, Preface, lxxviii.

they were onerous even upon wealthy Catholics, and as Sir John Davys says, "even without any other addition, they were ruinous to peasants, churls and poor tradesmen."* However, to put still more pressure on the wealthier classes, recourse was had to royal "Mandates." These were letters under either the Privy or Broad Seal, addressed to any of his subjects *by name* by the king, commanding his particular attendance at Church in the presence of the Lord Deputy or of the President of the Provinces of Munster and Connaught, or of their respective Councils. Disobedience in such cases was to be construed into *a contempt of the King's majesty*, to be punished by the censure or decree of the Court of Star or Castle Chamber, with a heavy fine, and imprisonment during pleasure. The jurisdiction claimed in such cases was completely novel and unheard of.†

On the publication of the King's Proclamation of the 4th of July, 1605, the nobility and gentry of the Pale sent a numer-

* Letter to Salisbury, Calendar, Vol. 1, p. 466.

† The word STAR-CHAMBER has been long used to express a proceeding which if not absolutely illegal, is regarded as unconstitutional and tyrannical. The word is supposed to be derived from the circumstance that the room in the palace of Westminster, in which what was afterwards called the Court of Star-Chamber met, had its ceiling ornamented with gilt stars. This Court cannot be clearly traced back to its origin, which is very remote. We find its powers abridged by several acts passed in the reign of Edward III. Its jurisdiction was regarded as an encroachment upon the common law, and as such, the Commons were always jealous of its existence. The business of this Court was transacted by the King's Council, or that portion of it called the *Concilium Ordinarium*, to distinguish it from the *Privy Council*, whose members were the deliberative advisers of the Crown. But in later years the constitution of this *Concilium* was modified more than once. We find the Council of Star-Chamber in full operation in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. It was at times found useful against great and powerful transgressors, who, in those days, were often strong enough to set the ordinary tribunals at defiance; but in her reign it degenerated into a mere engine of state, which it continued to be until its abolition in the last Parliament of Charles I. (16 Car. c. 10.). In Ireland this Court was called the Court of Star or Castle Chamber. There were two modes of procedure in it; (1) by information or bill and answer, in which case interrogatories were exhibited in writing to the defendant, to be answered on oath. But this was a tedious method, and very distasteful to Elizabeth and others, who desired to have their wishes carried out without delay; and Lord Bacon discouraged the King from adopting this mode of proceeding, saying that "The Star-Chamber without confession was *long seas*" (*Bacon's Works*, Vol. iii. p. 372). Hence (2) proceeding by confession became the favourite method; in which case the business was conducted orally. In *theory* the accused could not be charged unless he made confession "freely and voluntarily without constraint" (*Hudson on the Star-Chamber*); in *practice*, pressure of every kind, including torture, was wickedly and unscrupulously applied to the unfortunate accused, to wring a confession from him, and on such confession he was tried and condemned. Under this system during the last century of the existence of the Court, every variety of punishment short of death was inflicted "by a Court composed of members of the King's Council, upon a mere oral proceeding without hearing the accused, without a written charge or record of any kind, and without appeal." (*Cyclopædia of Political Knowledge*. Art. *Star-Chamber*.)

ously signed petition to the Lord Deputy, praying for a suspension of the order for the banishment of priests, until they should have an opportunity of laying the matter before the King ; but Chichester, so far from complying with their request, prepared another edition of the Proclamation, adding a *new* clause that brought the recusants within the grasp of the Star Chamber, which the first edition did not. Under this proclamation "Mandates" in the King's name were issued to sixteen of the chief Aldermen and citizens of Dublin, to attend the Mayor to Christ's Church to hear divine service, and to present themselves there before the Lord Deputy and Council. The Aldermen being Catholics did not attend ; so they were summoned before the Court of Star-Chamber, where six of them were fined £100 each, and the remainder £50 each. "The last part of the sentence," writes Sir Arthur Chichester, "was that they should all remain prisoners in this Castle during the Lord Deputy's and this Council's pleasure."* The Court further directed that part of the fines was to be expended in repairing the protestant churches in Dublin, and part in relieving poor scholars in the College [Trinity College], "and in other necessary and charitable uses," "in order," magnanimously adds Chichester, "that they might perceive that it was not their goods, but their conformity which was sought."†

As soon as the Aldermen saw the storm coming they endeavoured to save their property by making it over to their children, apprentices and friends. The Attorney-General impeached this proceeding as "fraudulent," but a jury refused to find it so, whereupon he proceeded to the Star-Chamber, where all the judges having been summoned to assist, the deeds were condemned as "void and of no effect against the King's execution." This decision of the Star-Chamber pleased Sir John Davys immensely, who calls it "the best precedent and example that had been made in that Kingdom for many years."‡ These proceedings, unwonted and unconstitutional as they were, raised universal indignation among the Catholics, and a "Monster," as it was then called a "multitudinarian," petition was prepared ; and the principal men—Lords Gormanston, Trimbleston, Killeen, and Howth, complained "temperately," to Salisbury, that greater severity was used in the execution of the King's Proclamation than was intended by his majesty ; in proof of which they referred him to the first edition of it, in which it was stated that the penalties should be limited to what was contained in the statutes

* Calendar, Vol. 1, p. 350.

† Ibid, 348.

‡ Ibid, p. 402.

of the realm of Ireland. They complained that the Star-Chamber was never before used as a "Spiritual Consistory," and that now for the first time men were brought before it for not going to church, and were there fined and imprisoned; and that in the levying the fines their houses and doors were broken open, and their wives and children distressed and terrified.*

Lord Gormanston and Sir Patrick Barnewall, as representatives of the subscribers to the petition, being very pressing for an answer to it, Chichester summoned them with some others to appear before him, and committed them all to the Castle prison.† Sir Patrick Barnewall, behaved with much courage and manliness before the Council, and when Chichester insinuated that he saw reason for thinking there might be concert between the petitioners and the traitors who had contrived the late treason in England (alluding to the gunpowder plot), Sir Patrick Barnewall said "that the Deputy's speech was wire-drawing and without probability or likelihood." Again, when the Chief Justice (Sir James Loy) undertook to explain to him his transgression in defending the petition, telling him that he had spoken without proper respect for the place where he was, Sir Patrick told him to "leave his carping," and therewith struck the cushion before the Deputy sitting in Council, and held his hand thereon until he was reproved for it.‡

After another set-to with the Lord Deputy he was silenced, committed to the constable, and hurried off to prison.§

Sir Henry Brouncker, the President of Munster, was perfectly convinced that the carrying out of the persecuting laws and proclamations would make Ireland protestant, and compel it to be loyal; "for," he says, "without foreign aid their force is as nothing." "Therefore," he quaintly concludes, "with one heating to make two nails, it (persecution) shall rivet the State of Ireland, plant religion, and kill rebellion."

How false this opinion was, appears from the state of Munster, on Brouncker's death, which happened not long after he wrote the above words. On his death the Earl of Thomond, jointly with Sir Richard Morrison, was appointed to govern till a new president should be named. That nobleman, writing to Salis-

* Preface, lxxxi.

† Preface, lxxxi.

‡ Calendar, Vol. 1, p. 447.

§ Ibid. and Preface, lxxxi. Sir Patrick declared that he was not the contriver of the petition, but that he had "scanned" it, and conceived it to be dutifully framed and void of offence. The device of "Mandates" was never tried in England; in Ireland it ended with the determined resistance of Sir Patrick Barnewall.

bury on 6th September, 1607, says that he found the province "swarming" with priests, and had placed some horse at Clonmel and Cashel, under good officers, hoping to take some of them, those towns being their chief resort; but all in vain. They were so befriended that none of them could be caught.*

Brouncker's severity had another effect; it caused petitions to be sent to the Lord Deputy against him from many of the merchants and inhabitants of the corporate towns. Chichester with his usual mean chicanery, said they only pretended "to be alarmed;" as if they had not sufficient cause for real alarm. They were alarmed for their religion, and to preserve it they "gave over their trades and betook themselves into the country, openly professing that they would abandon their traffic beyond the seas, rather than that the president [Brouncker] should be benefitted by the impost on wines; and that they would rather incur any infliction of the law than he should gain any glory or commendation in the work which he intended,"—which was the extirpation of the Catholic religion out of Munster.†

Brouncker, in his zeal, overshot the mark; and the Lords of the English Council became alarmed on receipt of Chichester's letter, inasmuch as the loyalty of the towns was always the mainstay of English power in Ireland, and Brouncker's intemperate persecution imperilled it. In fact the towns had been built by the English, and continued to be inhabited chiefly by them and their descendants. The Lords of the Council, therefore, felt it necessary to write to Chichester to make some relaxations; saying that the loyalty of the towns had continued "steadfast during the (late) rebellion, assisted by the Spanish forces, which makes them fit to be cherished, and therefore a special care should be taken for preserving their good affection."‡

The same activity prevailed in Connaught, as in Leinster and Munster, in compelling the attendance of the Irish Catholics at the services of the Established Church; and sharp fines were levied for non-attendance and contumacy. For instance we find William Lynch Fitzpeter fined £40, Oliver Browne £40, James Lynch Fitzmartin, £40, Marcus Lynch Fitzwilliam £30, Thomas Browne £20,§ for refusing to attend.

* Preface lxxxix.

† Chichester to the Lords of the Council, 4th August, 1607.

‡ Preface, p. xcvi. Lords of the Privy Council to Sir Arthur Chichester, 21st July, 1607.

§ Mem. Roll, Easter Term, 5 Jac. I., Art 6, MS. Pub. Rec. Office Ireland. Quoted in Preface, p. xcix.

CHAPTER V.

WHEN O'Neill and O'Donnell had to fly from Ireland, what Bacon called "the ripeness of time" had come. So James planted Ulster; which simply meant that he seized that province and parcelled it out to English and Scotch undertakers, who, as in the case of Munster, should be protestants; and this condition he puts forward more formally than Elizabeth had done, it being particularly mentioned in the agreement with the undertakers "that they should not suffer any labourer that would not take the oath of supremacy to dwell upon their lands."* In the articles drawn up by the king's order concerning the English and Scottish undertakers, who were to plant their portions with English and inland Scottish tenants it is laid down (article 7) that "the said undertakers, their heirs and assigns shall not alien or demise their portions, or any part thereof to the *meer Irish*, or to such persons as will not take the oath which the said undertakers are bound to take by the former article." This was the oath of supremacy, which no Catholic could take without denying his faith.† The king sometimes allowed the laws against Catholics to remain in abeyance, but this was caused by policy. "James himself was convinced," says Dr. Lingard, "that before he could extirpate the Catholic worship, it would be necessary to colonize the other provinces after the example of Ulster."‡

In planting Ulster James was determined to avoid what he regarded as a grievous mistake in the plantation of Munster, namely, giving all the plains to the English undertakers, whilst the Irish were driven to the woods and mountains, which became, for them, so many strongholds, whence they made attacks upon the settlers, carrying off their cattle, and inflicting various other injuries upon them. As far as it could be done

* Cox, Vol. 2, p. 15. "Attempts were made to introduce order and the Protestant religion into Ireland by colonization. But as the ministers of James proceeded on the principle of spoliation, they engendered only distrust, irritation and revenge, and left a plenteous harvest of rebellions and massacres to his successors."—*Wade's British History Chronologically arranged*, 3rd Ed. p. 165.

† The oath of supremacy was first passed in 1534, by the 26th of Henry the 8th. It constituted the king supreme head of the church instead of the Pope, enacting that, "Kings of this realm shall be taken, accepted, and reputed *the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England*."

‡ Lingard's England, Vol. vii, p. 94. Ed. London, 1855.

he, therefore, gave the English and Scotch settlers those localities which, from a military point of view, were places of strength, besides being the richest and most fertile parts of the province; while "such natives as succeeded in obtaining small grants were not permitted to remain on the lands they had previously occupied, nor even anywhere in their native districts, but were dismissed into certain baronies set apart for them, and proverbially known as the most barren in the respective counties to which they belonged. A few servitors, or military men, were located in each of such baronies, to watch and overawe the native grantees; but as a matter of course, the servitors' grants included whatever good lands could be found in the several bleak and rugged districts referred to."* The quantity of land given away to undertakers, and for other purposes, by the confiscation of Ulster has been persistently understated in the most shameful manner. Sir Richard Cox sets down the whole of the escheated lands at 511,465 acres; of which, he says, *servitors and natives* were allotted 116,330 acres. This entry is very cunningly devised; servitors and natives are confounded, lest we should know how much or how little the natives obtained. We may feel assured, however, that the civil and military servants of the crown got the lions' share, both in quantity and quality.† "But whether the lands given to natives were good, bad, or indifferent, the servitors, in numerous instances, soon became their owners, especially where such lands were granted in tolerably large quantities to natives of rank. Indeed to make sure of this result in certain desirable cases, the servitors got grants of the natives' lands in reversion, and entered into possession at the deaths of the latter, whilst the rightful heirs, generally children of high rank, were thus left destitute."‡ For, as Dr. Leland says:—"The planters had not only

* Rev. George Hill's *Plantation of Ulster*; Preface, pp. ii, iii.

† This entry of Cox's forcibly reminds me of one made in the *Irish Poor Law Report* for 1847, in which year (the Great Famine year) the people died in the workhouses at a most frightful rate. So frightful was the mortality, that the Commissioners, not wishing to state it exactly, headed one of their columns in their report thus—"Died or *left the House*." All under this heading left the House, but in regard to how many left it alive to face the famine, then raging outside, we are left in ignorance.

‡ The Rev. G. Hill's *Plantation of Ulster*, Preface iii. Those rightful heirs had to take to the woods, whence they sallied forth from time to time, and levied black mail on the settlers. They were called woodkerne by the English, and became very formidable. To kill one of them was regarded as an act worthy of special reward, and Sir Oliver St. John (afterwards Viscount Grandison), who succeeded Chichester as Lord Deputy, boasts in a letter, that he had destroyed in three years 300 of "those idle sons of gentlemen."

neglected to perform their covenants, but the Commissioners appointed to distribute the lands scandalously abused their trusts, and by fraud or violence deprived the natives of those possessions which the king had reserved for them. Some indeed were suffered to enjoy a small pittance of such reservation, others were totally ejected.*

Instead of the escheated lands being only about half a million of acres, as stated by Cox, it is now ascertained beyond doubt that they comprised six counties of Ulster, namely, Armagh, Tyrone, Coleraine, Donegal, Fermanagh and Cavan, which six counties contain about 3,698,000 statute acres, all of which were made available for the purposes of the plantation. Londonderry did not exist as a county before the Plantation. At that period it was formed out of several fragments; one of the baronies of Tyrone, the three baronies which constituted the old county of Coleraine, a small portion of Donegal, and another small portion of Antrim, were united and constituted into the new county of Derry, which was handed over to twelve London Companies for plantation,† and was, therefore, called Londonderry.‡

The vast discrepancies in the statements as to the actual extent of the escheated lands arose from several causes, such as hasty surveys, corrupt manipulation on the part of those engaged in the survey, and in a great degree from the system adopted of setting down vast tracts of good pasture lands as "unprofitable" and therefore not included in the acreage returned by the Commissioners. As an example of this we may quote the fact that by the admission of the London Societies, two proportions belonging to them, which were returned as containing 2,500 acres were actually found to contain 10,000 acres. But a still more striking instance is that of Trinity College, "which was represented by plantation documents as obtaining just 10,000 acres in Ulster; the reality being is that 'Old Trinity' owns 96,000 statute acres of the escheated lands in the counties of Armagh, Fermanagh, and Donegal."§ In a word, when Wentworth began in 1633 to look carefully into the patents of the Undertakers, in order to obtain money from them for his Royal Master, he found that those

* History of Ireland, vol. 2, p. 467. 4to Ed.

† Viz. :—The Mercers

The Grocers (in part)

The Drapers

The Fishmongers

The Goldsmiths

The Skinners.

The Clothworkers

The Merchant Tailors

The Haberdashers

The Salters

The Ironmongers

The Vintners

‡ See Hill's Plantation of Ulster, p. 354.

§ Ibid, Preface vi.

patents, as a general rule, did not express more than the tenth part of the lands actually possessed by the patentees.*

The Plantation of Ulster was, from the English point of view, a great success, and, humanly speaking, would have abolished the Irish race and the Catholic Religion in that province in a couple of generations, if the plans laid down were strictly carried out in practice. But this was not, and, in fact, could not be done. The patentees failed to secure the full number of English and Scotch tenants for all the lands, so they let farms to the natives, contrary to the terms of their patents; and, in truth, they preferred them as tenants, in as much as the Irish were far better rent payers than the English and Scotch, who felt that they had rights which the natives had not, and therefore acted with a certain independence; whilst the Irish, quiet and submissive in all things, were thankful and even grateful for being permitted to exist. And so, under Providence, they did exist and multiply in spite of the fiercest and best planned exterminating laws, until once again, they are able, and well able, to hold their own among the picturesque hills and on the fair undulating plains of Ulster, the home of their fathers.

[The Parliament of 1613].

A Parliament was summoned in 1613 for various purposes, but chiefly, says Leland, "to support the arrangement lately made;" that is, to give Parliamentary sanction to the Plantation of Ulster just effected. To that Parliament it was certain the constituencies would return a large majority of Catholics, who, in spite of the Penal laws, were still nine-tenths of the population.† But Chichester saw the difficulty, and explained to the King the necessity of finding a remedy for it. The remedy was obvious enough; a protestant majority must be secured at all hazards, to override the Catholic vote, and establish *Protestant*

* Hill and Strafford's Letters and Despatches, Vol. 1, p. 132.—"The City of London, which held the plantations of Londonderry and Coleraine of the Crown, was summoned for breach of agreements, by the non-performance of certain articles, and though the Company offered a compromise by paying £30,000, it was not considered enough, and on being brought before the Star Chamber the whole Plantation was declared forfeited and a fine of £70,000 imposed." Cooper's Life of Wentworth, Vol. 1, p. 323.

† "When Chichester had made a present of a fine horse to his royal master, the king asked if it were Irish breed, and being answered in the affirmative, his majesty swore aloud, that then certainly it must be a papist; for that he believed all things produced in Ireland, even the very animals, were papists. And Chichester himself, in a moment of irritation at failing in withdrawing some persons of consequence from their religion, exclaimed, that he believed the very air and soil of Ireland were infected with Popery." *Annal. Sacr.* quoted in a note by Plowden, *Historical Review*, Vol. I, p. 108.

Ascendancy in the house.* The Parliament was called in an underhand and irregular manner, the usual formalities not having been observed. One of the formalities omitted in the case was very important, namely, the sending beforehand to the peers of Parliament the heads of the bills intended to be introduced, and to this fact the King's attention was directed by the five Lords of the Pale who addressed him in November, 1612.† The Catholics took alarm at the omission, and very justly, as the event proved; for one of the bills drafted was for the expulsion of the priests out of the country; another for the erection of a "convenient prison" for noblemen in the Castle of Dublin [Catholics of course]; another for the distribution of monies forfeited by the Catholics for refusing to attend the protestant service; another for doubling the fine for not attending it; another to provide that "stubborn corporations" [*i.e.* that would persist in returning Catholics] should be deprived of the franchise; and lastly a bill for the sending of noblemen's children into England [in order to be brought up protestants]. But these acts did not eventually become law, probably on account of the bold stand made by the Catholics.‡

Chichester resolved to create, by the King's authority of course, a number of new boroughs sufficient to swamp the old constituencies, and place the Catholics in a minority. He went on creating till the new boroughs amounted to forty, some say even more, for all of which he had his own creatures elected; "few or none of these," say the recusant Lords to the king, "had their residence or being, (as by law they ought to have) in those places, for which they appeared, many of them having never seen them."§ Most of the new corporations had their patents and charters after the date of the commission for holding the

* It is here we encounter for the first time, the phrase "Protestant Ascendancy." In later times it became the rallying cry and charter toast of the Orangemen. Among the many curses which have befallen this ill-starred land, few have brought greater mischief to our people than this vile, tyrannical and indefensible party Shibboleth. Chichester himself had been a pupil of the famous puritan divine, Thomas Cartwright, who was a professor and fellow of Cambridge, and who was deprived of both appointments on account of his strong puritan doctrines.

† The Lords who signed this address were:—Gormanston, Trimbleston, Dunsany, Slane, and Louth. They expressed to him a fearful suspicion that the erecting into corporations "the poor villages in the poorest country in Christendom," tended to nothing else "but that by the voices of a few selected for that purpose, under the name of burgesses, extreme penal laws would be imposed" on his majesty's subjects. *Desiderata Curiosa Hibernica*, Vol. I, p. 106.

‡ Cox's History, Vol. 2, p. 18. O'Sullivan's Cath. History, 240 & 241.

§ *Desid. Cur. Hib. Vol. I., p. 220.*

parliament, and some after the writs of summons to attend parliament had been issued.*

The number of knights and burgesses returned from the old and new constituencies amounted altogether to 232, of whom 226 appeared in the House on the first day of the session, the 18th of May, 1613. On that day parliament was formally opened, but there was no business done; on the next day came the great contention about the election of a Speaker. The Protestants—Chichester's party—proposed Sir John Davys, who was Attorney-General, for the post, whilst the Catholics, otherwise the recusants, as they were called, proposed Sir John Everard, some time Chief Justice of the King's Bench. The Catholics maintained that the validity of the late elections should be examined before the election of the Speaker; the Protestants held, that the House would have no authority to enter upon such examination until a Speaker was chosen. Eventually the election was proceeded with, and according to a paper drawn up by Edmond Wedhopp, Clerk of the House of Commons, 127 voted for Sir John Davys, being all protestants, and 97† for Sir John Everard, all Catholics. The scrutiny, therefore, gave a considerable majority to the former; but, as the Catholics maintained that the members for the newly created boroughs were not legally members, Sir John Everard, according to them, had the true majority.‡ The number of members returned for the new boroughs was 78, which when taken from the 127 votes given for Sir John Davys leaves only 49 votes for him from the old constituencies. The Catholics placed Sir John Everard in the chair. The protestants put Sir John Davys in his lap, and after an undignified altercation Sir John Davys retained possession of the chair, and the Catholics withdrew, refusing to take any further part in the proceedings of the Parliament.

* Ibid, p. 225. "He [Chichester] was effectually assistant to plough and break up (say Dr. Fuller and Mr. Prince) that barbarous nation by conquest, and then to sow it with seeds of civility; when L.D." (Lord Deputy)—(Lodge, Vol. 1, p. 318.) Chichester was well rewarded for the "seeds of civility" sown by him in Ireland. Sir John Davys writing from the camp near Lifford, 12th September, 1609, says "the bishops have rents and duties out of the Termon lands, but the proprietary is found in the Erenagh and their septs. There are more parcels of lands of this nature found in Enishowen than in any other barony, which diminishes not a little the value of the Lord Deputy's [Chichester's] portion." Plantation of Ulster by Rev. George Hill, p. 176. Mr. Hill adds in a note:—"Considering the immense extent of the Deputy's grant—nearly 200,000 acres—neither he nor his friend Davys need have grudged the Erenagh and Termon lands therein, except indeed from the circumstance that these fragments were better cultivated than the other portions throughout Inishowen."

† "The Declaration of the Protestants," says "four score and Eighteen" (Calendar, 1611-1614, p. 403.)

The Catholic peers and members of parliament at once proceeded to prepare an address to the King. It is dated the 19th of May, the next day, and is entitled "The letter of divers Lords of the Pale." It is couched in most respectful language, but it also contains a good deal of manly independent feeling. James regarded it as downright insolent. In it they say "that many knights from counties and citizens and burgesses from cities and towns have, contrary to the true election, been returned, and in some places force, and in many others fraud, deceit, and indirect means used for effecting of this so lawless a course of proceeding. Neither can we but make known unto your majesty, that under pretence of erecting towns in places of the new plantation, more corporations have been made since the beginning of last month, or a little more, than are returned out of the whole kingdom; besides, the number whereof (as we conceive it) contrary to your highness's intended purpose, are dispersed throughout all parts of the kingdom;* and that in divers places where there be good ancient boroughs, and not allowed to send burgesses to the parliament; and yet these new created corporations for the most part are so miserable and beggarly poor, as their *tuguria* cannot otherwise be holden or denied than *tituli sine re, et fugimenta in rebus*, for divers of which their extreme poverty being not able to defray the charges of burgesses, nor the places themselves, to afford any one man fit to present himself in the poorest society of men, though we must confess that some of great fashion have not sticked to abase themselves to these places, do appear. The Lord Deputy's servants, attornies and clerks, resident only in the city of Dublin, most of them never having seen or known the places for which they were returned, and others of contemptible life and carriage; and what outrageous violence was offered yesterday to a grave gentleman, whom men of all sorts that know him do and will confess him to be both learned, grave, and discreet, and free from all touch and imputation, whom those of the lower house, to whom no exceptions could be taken, had

* The new boroughs are usually set down at 40, but the exact number was 39, nearly half of which were in Ulster. They were distributed as follows:—Leinster 6, Munster 8, Connaught 6, Ulster 18. Total 38. In a state paper of James the First's reign a complete list of the old and new boroughs is given. Under the head of "Catherlagh" [Carlow] we find this remark—"None in the whole country, there being no town fit for it," but the following note in Chichester's hand is in the margin, "The town of Catherlagh is, since the writing of the former, made a borough." This gave 7 to Leinster instead of 6, and brought the total up to 39. The reason for giving so many boroughs to Ulster is of course quite obvious. *Calendar of State Papers [Ireland] 1611-1614, p. 333, et seq.*

chosen to be their Speaker, we leave, for avoiding tediousness to your highness, to their own further declaration.”*

They then ask permission to send a deputation to his majesty to explain the matter more fully to him.

The same peers addressed a letter to the English Privy Council, in which they thus enlarge on the grievance of creating the forty boroughs:—“Coming according to our bounden duties into the parliament house, we find there 14 councillors of state; 3 of the judges, having before received writs to appear in the higher house, all his majesty’s council at law, and the rest of the number, for the most part, consisting of attornies; clerks of courts of the Lord Deputy’s retinue, and others his household servants, with some lately come out of England, having no abiding place here; and all these, save very few, were returned, from the new corporations, erected to the number of 40 or thereabouts, not only in places of the new plantation, but also in other provinces, where there be corporations of antiquity; few or none of them having been ever resident, and most of them having never seen these places; the rest, who possessed the rooms of Knights of Shires, save 4 or 6, came in by practice, and dishonest devices, whereunto themselves were not strangers; and some there were from ancient boroughs, who intruded themselves into their places, by as undue and unlawful means, as the knights and burgesses duly elected were ready at the parliament door to prove and avouch; for redress whereof, we of the ancient shires, cities and towns, to whom no exceptions could be taken, being desirous to take the usual and accustomed course, what outrageous violence ensued by the fury of some there, we humbly leave to your lordship to be informed by our declaration, whereunto a schedule, by direction of my Lord Deputy, subscribed with our hands, is annexed.”† Towards the close of the month letters arrived from England calling upon the recusant Lords to appear before the king by deputation, according to their request, but before this intimation was conveyed to them, “The Lord Deputy, with all expedition, sent the Earl of Thomond, Sir John Denham, Chief Justice of the King’s Bench, and Sir Oliver St. John, master of the Ordnance, into England, there to certify his majesty the truth of all the proceedings of the parliament in Ireland, and to reply against the Lords Recusants:”‡—that is, to

* *Desiderata Hib. Cur. Vol. I, p. 198.* This Address was signed by 12 peers, viz.:—the Lords Buttevant, Gormanston, Roche, Fermoy, Mountgarret, Killeen, Delvin, Slane, Trimbleston, Dunboyne, Louth and Cahir.

† *Desiderata Cur. Hib. pp. 202-3, Vol. I.*

‡ *Desiderata Hib. Cur. Vol. I, p. 206.* In a part of the instructions sent to the Earl of Thomond, Sir John Denham and Sir Oliver St. John by the Lord Deputy Chichester, we read:—“Whereas they [the Catholics] say that such as

reply against them before they had got the opportunity of putting their case. The Catholic Deputation consisted of the Lords Gormanston and Dunboyne, Sir Christopher Plunket and Sir James Gough, Knights, and William Talbot and Edward Fitzharris, Esquires.

The Catholics set about raising a subscription to defray the expenses of the Deputation, which when Chichester heard he sent proclamations through the kingdom forbidding the collection of any money for such a purpose, deploring, at the same time, with the most unusual consideration and sympathy, the manner in which the people "were sorely vexed and molested by the collectors, and advertising all his majesty's subjects that there was not any such matter as setting up of religion or liberty of conscience to be looked for, and that the lords and others that went over were sent by special commandment from the king's majesty, to answer such abuses and absurd dealings as hath been committed in the parliament-house and elsewhere in other places of the realm, about choosing the knights of the shires and the burgesses of cities and corporate towns, to attend in that high court of parliament; and likewise straight charge and commandment was given in the said proclamation, that no more monies should be collected in that nature, but the money wheresoever collected should be redelivered back again to the owners, upon pain of great punishments to be inflicted: and so that collection ceased."* The supplies having been thus cut off, the king completed the dilemma of the Deputation, by detaining them in London, under pretence that he had not time to investigate the business on which they had been summoned. After some considerable time, they sent a petition to him reminding him that they had been a long time awaiting his majesty's "gracious pleasure" touching the matter on which they had been summoned; that their means were altogether spent, and the supply of their wants become hopeless, on account of the Lord Deputy's proclamation against any voluntary contribution towards their "necessary charges," whilst in attendance upon his "princely pleasure." Of this appeal the partisan chronicler of Chichester's rule

were returned to their party were without exception, you may show the contrary by showing how many of them were heads of rebellion in the last wars, how some of them can speak no English, how they were all elected by a general combination and practice of *jesuits and priests*, who charged the people upon pain of excommunication not to elect any of the King's religion." *Ibid.* p. 208. This was poor logic for Chichester to use, but it was quite "good enough for the Jury," the Jury in the case being James himself.

* *Ibid.* pp. 210-11.

in Ireland *naively* says:—"There was not any speedy answer made to this petition, by reason his majesty *was not then at leisure*."*

At length about the end of September the king appointed four "worthy and very learned gentlemen for commissioners," to go to Ireland and investigate upon the spot the complaints put forward by the recusant peers. The first person named on this Commission was Sir Humphrey Winche, who had been, for some time, lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench in Ireland. But the whole commission was a sham and a make-believe, seeing that whereas the complaints laid before the King inculpated the Lord Deputy more than any body else, he was nevertheless joined in the patent with the other four *as chief Commissioner*, and as such became chief judge in his own cause. Yet in face of this James had the cool effrontery to tell the Catholic Deputation that he dealt with him [Chichester], not as with his servant, but as with a "party;" meaning that he dealt with him as with an accused person; as if in spite of all that was alleged against him he had found him a faithful servant.† Chichester was in the North when the four English commissioners arrived, but at once hastened to Dublin, where he received them and gave them "very honourable entertainment, and henceforward sat daily with them examining the controversies according to their commission."‡

The King having "well perused and considered the report of his commissioners," sent forth a proclamation in which he declares his great disappointment at the ingratitude of those who had laid their grievances before him, inasmuch as, instead of being filled with gratitude and of making humble acknowledgment of his "princely favours," they had done nothing but importune him with exaggerated complaints against his state, and particularly against the person of his Lord Deputy.§ With this proclamation was sent over a friendly letter from the King to Chichester, calling him to England, and also a commission for the appointment of Lords Justices during his absence.

What little chance the Catholics of Ireland had of getting justice from James against his pet Lord Deputy may be learned from two facts:—(1) That for his energy and determination in rooting the Catholics out of Ulster and planting it with Scotch and English protestants he had been created Baron Chichester of Belfast, more than a year before the parliament of 1613 had

* *Desid. Hib. Cur. Vol. I, p. 237*, compiled and edited by Mr. Lodge.

† *Ibid. p. 303.*

‡ *Ibid. p. 283.*

§ *Ibid. p. 291.*

been assembled, and, that (2) as a further mark of his royal favour, he was granted, as we have seen, the whole of Inishowen, O'Doherty's country, which consisted of about 200,000 acres, less the churchlands, which were set apart in it for the support of religion.

After a full year's delay, James, on the 12th of April, 1614, gave his final views to the Catholic Deputation, in a speech which he evidently regarded as a masterpiece of wisdom and ability. In it he tells them that the letter sent to him from Ireland before the parliament sat was "rash" and "insolent," and that the one sent in the beginning of the parliament was "full of pride and arrogance, wanting much of the respects which servants owe to their sovereign." Of fourteen returns made to that parliament, which the petition of the Catholics said were false returns, the King declared that only two of them had been proved to be so; whereas, in his instructions sent to the Lord Deputy, he acknowledged *thirteen* out of the fourteen false returns, and ordered them to be annulled.*

"You complain," he says, "of the new boroughs; therein I would fain feel your pulse, for I yet find not where the shoe wrings. For first, they question the power of the King, whether he may lawfully make them: and then you question the wisdom of the King and his council, in that you say there are too many made. It was never before heard, that any good subjects did dispute the King's power in this point. *What is it to you whether I make many or few boroughs?* My council may consider the fitness, if I require it. But what if I had created forty noblemen, and four hundred boroughs? The more the merrier, the fewer the better cheer."† He further says to them:—"You that are of a contrary religion must not look to be the only lawmakers; you that are but half subjects should have but half privileges; you have but one eye to me one way, and to the pope another way; the pope is your father in *spiritualibus* and I in *temporalibus* only, and so have your bodies turned one way, and your souls drawn another way; you that send your children to the seminaries of treason. Strive henceforth to become good subjects, that you may have *cor unum et viam unam*, and then I shall respect you all alike. But your Irish priests teach you such grounds of doctrine, as you cannot follow them with a safe conscience, but you must cast off your loyalty to the king."‡

* *Desid. Hib. Cur. Vol. I, p. 324.*

† *Desid. Hib. Cur. Vol. I, p. 308.*

‡ *Ibid.* 310. James evidently held to its extremest limit, what Pope calls, with happy point, "The RIGHT DIVINE of Kings to govern wrong."—*Dunciad, Book IV, line 188.* The speech from which the above passages are quoted is given

There were always great jealousies and rivalries amongst the English in Ireland, and the successful man was sure to have many enemies. This was the case with Chichester, who was the most successful adventurer of his time; for while he did the King's business in the Plantation of Ulster, he managed to seize for himself as much land as would set up two or three German Grand Dukes. Whisperings reached the King that he was extravagant with the public money, and that the King's coffers in Ireland were not replenished as well as they might be. Chichester becoming aware of these charges, defended himself in a letter to Lord Ellesmere, and "desires to be judged by his actions rather than by vague reports and malicious detractors."* He was, however, recalled, but honoured by James with the Treasurership of Ireland, and with the title of Baron of Belfast. Sir Oliver St. John, long connected with this country, was installed Lord Deputy in his place, on the 2nd of July, 1616. St. John was a soldier, and had been Master of the Ordnance. His government was a continuous persecution of the Catholics. Even Cox, in his sly, dry way, says of him, that "he behaved briskly against the papists."† Leland speaks more openly than Cox: he tells us that St. John's conduct in the Parliament of 1618, "showed him to be actuated with peculiar zeal against popery; and whether provoked by the insolence of the recusant party, or that his nature and principles disposed him to treat them with less lenity than they had for some time experienced, he soon proceeded to a vigorous execution of the penal statutes."‡ O'Sullivan says Sir Oliver St. John was a cruel man, who stirred up the heat of a tremendous tyranny, and that on assuming office, he was reported to have sworn that he would make sure that in two years all Catholic priests would be expelled from Ireland.

in a different and considerably modified form in the Calendar of State Papers (1611-1614, p. 472) from the way in which it is given in the *Desiderata Curiosa Hib.* and Cox's History. The speech in the two latter works is exactly the same, and is reported as spoken in the first person; in the Calendar it is reported indirectly [so to speak], and is abbreviated and toned down in several places. The greater part of the passage quoted above about feeling the "pulse" of the deputation, and not being able to discover "where the shoe wrings," is omitted in the Calendar. In a word the King's speech as we find it in the Calendar is, in modern parlance "cooked." Yet of that toned down and modified report the Editors of the Calendar say that "it exhibits within a short compass all the peculiarities of his mind and temper—a singular mixture of cleverness and folly, of jocular familiarity and imperious rebuke, of menaces and gibes, of arguments and puns, of solemn appeals and coarse buffoonery." *Preface, p. lvi.*

* Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1615-1625, p. 115.

† History of Ireland, Vol. 2, p. 33.

‡ Leland's History, Vol. 2, p. 461, 4to Ed.

To carry out this threat, he commissioned judges to go into various parts of the country to search for priests, and to compel laymen to give an account of themselves. He strictly exacted the fines imposed on Catholics for absenting themselves from the protestant service, and the prisons were filled with Catholics who refused to take the oath of supremacy.* He pushed forward the plantation of Wexford and says, not without a certain air of exultation, that he and his Council "have toiled and laboured through three plantations, and are now ready to go on with a fourth."† Writing to the Lords of the English Council about the Wexford people who had come to him, and who had "lately vexed their lordships with clamours against the distribution of land there," he says, he "heard them patiently and examined their pretences," and then "committed them to prison to terrify others."‡

Complaints from various quarters having reached James about St. John, he recalled him in 1622, but at the same time created him Viscount Grandison of Limerick.

Falkland, who succeeded Sir Oliver St. John as Lord Deputy, was sworn into office on the 8th of September, 1622; an event which was made remarkable by the sermon preached on the occasion. The preacher was Ussher, afterwards protestant primate of Ireland, but then bishop of Meath. Taking his text from St. Paul to the Romans (xiii. 4), "He beareth not the sword in vain," he proceeded to deliver what was regarded as an exhortation to the Lord Deputy to put the persecuting statutes in force against the Catholics, who were thereby at once aroused to indignation; and even moderate protestants thought Ussher's discourse, if not too severe, at least illtimed and imprudent. The protestant Primate, Archbishop Hampton, wrote to him about it; found fault with its severe tone, and asked him, like St. Peter (Acts xi) "to give a fair public satisfaction" for it. Falkland himself appears to have been offended with the sermon, for Archbishop Hampton in his letter says:—"My noble Lord Deputy

* Compendium of Catholic History, p. 335, Ed. 1850. The fine for each Sunday's absence from the protestant service was one shilling, but that was equal in value to four or five shillings at present. Besides, there was added to the fine a sum of ten shillings or so, for fees of clerks, officers, &c., the present value of such expenses being about £2 10s.; so that a Catholic had to pay something like £2 15s. per Sunday for absenting himself from the protestant service. The effect of these exactions was to empty the purses of the wealthy Catholics, and to force the poorer sort to fly from their homes, and hide themselves in woods and caves, thus becoming utterly ruined from being compelled to give up their usual avocations. Calendar of [Irish] State Papers, 1615-1625, p. 329.

† Calendar, 1615-1625, p. 305.

‡ Ibid.

hath propounded a way of pacification, that your lordship should here satisfy such of the Lords as would be present, wherein my poor endeavours shall not be wanting." The Archbishop further indicates to him that he is busying himself too much with external affairs instead of taking care of his diocese. His words are:—"Withal it will not be amiss, in mine opinion, for your lordship to withdraw yourself from these parts, and to spend more time in your own diocese."* It is not at all certain that Ussher took any notice of this letter, although the Primate was his immediate superior, Meath being in the ecclesiastical province of Armagh. Cox, indeed, says that through the clamour of the papists, "how groundless soever their clamour was, the bishop was fain to preach an explanatory sermon to appease it,"† but Mant says he failed to discover any verification of Cox's statement.

In the beginning of 1623 a Proclamation was published against Catholic priests of all denominations, ordering them to quit the kingdom within forty days, after which period all persons were forbidden to converse with them; but it is probable this Proclamation was not very rigorously enforced, as the negotiations about the Spanish marriage at this juncture caused the King to suspend, for a time, the active enforcement of the penal statutes against the Catholics. A year after the above Proclamation was issued, writing to Secretary Conway, Falkland says that out of confidence in the Spanish match many sovereigns and mayors of towns were chosen from among the recusants, but "as their confidence has made them presume, so his doubtfulness made him to wink and forbear to question them for it."‡ Should the match however fail to be concluded, he considers it important that the Oath of Supremacy should be administered to them, "which," he says, "they would certainly refuse," and would be thus liable to the Star Chamber, "where good fines might be imposed upon the refusal."§

In pursuance of his belief that thorough colonization was necessary for the extirpation of the Catholic Faith, James proceeded to deal with Leinster and Connaught as he had dealt with Ulster. In July, 1615, Lord Deputy Chichester received a royal warrant empowering him to take surrenders of lands in the Province of Connaught, and in the County of Clare. This

* See the Primate's letter in full in Mant's History of the Church of Ireland, Vol. I, p. 410.

† Ibid. p. 412.

‡ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1615-1625, p. 456.

§ Ibid. p. 456.

warrant was very artfully drawn up. On the face of it, its object seemed to be to give the existing holders new and better titles to their lands than they had previously possessed; but the real intent was to plant those lands with English and Scotch, as Ulster had been planted. "Elevated," says Leland, "with the success of the great Northern plantation, and the flattering terms in which it had been approved by the Irish Parliament, he resolved to execute the same schemes in others of the unsettled districts of the island."* Sixty-six thousand acres between the river of Arklow and that of Slaney had been found by inquisition to be the property of the Crown. The real reason why this vast tract was found to belong to the Crown is naively given by Dr. Leland, where he says:—"The maritime parts of Leinster between Dublin and Waterford had been, for ages, possessed by powerful Irish Septs, who had kept the English Government in continual alarm, and harassed its forces by perpetual irruptions."† A chief sept among these—that of the O'Byrnes—was robbed in the most outrageous manner of a district called the Ranelaghs.‡ This was done by one Parsons, the ancestor of Lord Rosse, and a certain Lord Esmonde, who, on the false swearing of notorious thieves and criminals (pardoned on the condition of giving evidence against the O'Byrnes) seized the Ranelaghs and cast the O'Byrnes into prison. At length some just minded, honourable, Englishmen represented the case of the O'Byrnes so strongly to the King, that he was shamed into interfering. He caused the affair to be investigated. The O'Byrnes were honourably acquitted, but Parsons, who in the meantime had secured a patent for the Ranelaghs, *was allowed to hold the property undisturbed.*§ To quote again from Dr. Leland: "The counties Leitrim, Longford, and Westmeath, and those of the King and Queen, by their situation and circumstances required particular regulation; the assumption was, that all those counties were inhabited by savages," and, continues our Author, "to reduce these savages to

* History of Ireland, Book iv. c. 7.

† Ibid. See also Carew MSS. 1603 to 1624, pp. 321, et seq. The usual sham of a legal investigation was gone through in this as in so many other cases. The Lord Deputy (St. John) and Council writing to the English Privy Council inform them that "The territories of the Morrogher and Kinselaghes in the County of Wexford were *recovered* by his majesty by verdict and judgment in the Exchequer, and *the natives found intruders.*" [The italics are the Author's.] Calendar of State Papers (Ireland) 1615-1625, p. 303.

‡ The district called the Ranelaghs corresponded pretty much with the Catholic parish of Rathdrum, before it was made into two parishes by Most Rev. Archbishop McCabe.

§ Taylor's History of the Civil Wars in Ireland, Vol. I, pp. 243-6, and other authorities quoted in O'Connell's Memoir of Ireland.

order and subjection, inquisitions were held to examine the King's title to the whole, or any part of their lands." There could be but one result from such inquisitions, which was that "James deemed himself entitled to make a distribution of three hundred and eighty five thousand acres in these counties."* But this was only to open the way to the planting of the remaining three provinces after the manner of Ulster. Writing to Chichester in 1615, he says, he "finds no remedy for the barbarous manners of the meer Irish, which keeps out the knowledge of literature and of manual trades, to the lamentable impoverishment and, indeed, destruction of that people," but planting their lands as he did Ulster. "And being given to understand of some titles he has, as well general as special, to allow part of the territories called the County of Longford, the County of Leitrim, and other Irish counties in *Munster*, *Leinster*, and *Connaught*, the unsettled state of which he (the King) never hears of without grief" he appoints Chichester with some chosen Commissioners "to enquire into the King's title," the number and state of the inhabitants "and the chiefries claimed by the chief pretended lords, and how these chiefries may be reduced and settled."†

The following passage from Plowden will throw some light on the way in which the work was done: "In Connaught immense estates were declared forfeited to the Crown, *because the recent grants made to the proprietors upon their surrenders of them to James* had been NEGLECTED TO BE ENROLLED BY THE CLERKS IN CHANCERY, although the new grantees had paid above £3,000 into their hands for the enrolments, and *these* clerks alone could make them."‡

Could anything be more iniquitous? The proprietors had surrendered their lands to the Crown; the Crown regranted these lands to the same proprietors, on condition of having those grants enrolled in the usual way in Chancery. The proprietors complied with this regulation, and paid the Chancery clerks for the enrolment. Those clerks, either through neglect or malice *did not enrol the grants*, and no other person had power or authority to enrol them. They were the servants of the Crown, but the Crown instead of hastening to rectify the wicked neglect of its servants, took advantage of it, in order to rob its Catholic subjects wholesale and in the most flagitious manner.

* Leland, Book iv. c. 7. Quarto Ed. p. 461. Modern Surveys show there are 2,034,078 acres in the above counties. St. John wrote to the Lords of the Council that the whole of Longford consists of 50,000 acres. By modern Surveys it contains 269,409 acres.—Calendar of State Papers, p. 230, 1615-1625.

† Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1615-1625, p. 35.

‡ Plowden's Historical Review, Vol. I, p. 111.

CHAPTER VI.

THE IRISH COURT OF WARDS.

To the British Solomon, as his flatterers called James, we owe that artful and effective engine of religious persecution the Court of Wards; and to James solely, for he called it into existence by his own authority, the consent of parliament having been neither obtained nor sought. This scheme like many other wicked schemes had a misleading title; it was called a Court which was established for the better collection of the King's revenue from the wards of the Crown. Its real object was to rob all Catholic heirs of their religion. By its rules all heirs of lands held under the Crown—and at James's accession there was scarcely an acre in Ireland which was not so held—were obliged to sue out the livery of their lands in the Court of Wards; which Court was forbidden to grant such livery to any one who had not previously taken the oath of supremacy, as enacted in the first year of Elizabeth's reign, and also an oath abjuring several articles of Catholic belief. Thus the Catholic heir had no alternative but to forswear his religion or forfeit his property. But there was another provision which soon robbed some of the noblest families, native and Norman, of their faith, which was that, if the heir were a minor, it was reserved to the same Court to grant the wardship at discretion, but to oblige the grantee, by a clause inserted in his patent "to maintain and educate his ward in the English religion and habits in Trinity College, Dublin."* Had these regulations been strictly carried out, as James undoubtedly intended they should be, every landowner in Ireland, whether successor to an

* Note to "O'Flaherty's West Connaught," by Mr. Hardiman, p. 420. Among the many grievances complained of to James I, by the Lords of the English Pale in 1613, was that wardships were commonly granted to "mean men and meer strangers to the heirs . . . whereby the wards are neither well nurtured, bred nor preferred, and their kindred forbidden from any disposition of them." To this complaint Lord Deputy Chichester made the following answer:—"His Majesty's wards are granted unto such persons as the Lord Deputy doth think fit, who many times are the near friends of the ward, or else to persons of good worth and quality; and in every grant there is a clause, that the wards shall be brought up in the College near Dublin [Trinity] in English habits and religion; which is the ill nurture of which these petitioners complain and the only cause of their grievance on this point."—*Desiderata Cur. Hibernica*, Vol. 1, pp. 246-268.

English undertaker, or to a Lord of the Pale, or to an Irish Chieftain of Milesian blood, must within a very limited time have become a sworn protestant or a pauper. But the plan was often defeated by enfeoffments of the lands to secret trusts and uses, which withdrew the next heir from the jurisdiction of the Court, and enabled him to succeed to his inheritance without molestation on the ground of his religion.*

The Court of Wards was established by a commission directed to Sir John Denham, Knight, Chief Justice of the King's Bench, and others, bearing date the 20th of July, in the 14th year of the king's reign [1617].†

Whilst heirs who had come of age could sometimes manage to evade the nefarious conditions with which they were required to comply before they would be allowed to inherit the properties left to them by their fathers, minors were utterly helpless and completely in the hands of the court. The practice was to give them up to Protestant guardians, who were paid certain sums out of the minors' property for nurture and the destruction of their faith. In the eight years which intervened from the establishment of the court to the king's death, I find in the patent rolls about fifty minors who were thus handed over to guardians, all of which minors were the heirs of important Catholic families—some of them such as Lord Burke, Wm. Oge Barry, M'Dermot Roe, Barnwall, Kavanagh, Fitzgibbon, George Earl of Kildare, and James Butler, Lord Thurles, representing the very foremost Houses in the Kingdom. I give here in full the first wardship granted by the new court, as it is an index to all the others. It runs as follows:—"Grant to Sir Theobald Dillon, knt., of the wardship of Farrall O'Gara, grandson and next heir of Iriell O'Gara, late of Moy Gara, in Sligo Co., gent., deceased, for a fine of £8 17s. 9½d., and an annual rent of £18 8s. 0d. retaining thereout £9 English, for his maintenance and education in the English religion and habits, and in Trinity

* Lingard's England, Vol. vii. p. 199. It is pleasant to be able to say that in very many instances protestant friends and neighbours behaved with great kindness to the Catholics during these dreadful times, and were often the means of protecting their property from being escheated.

† Bacon seems to have been the suggester of the Court of Wards, as would appear by the following passage from his *Advice to Sir George Villiers concerning Ireland*; "Now in my opinion time will open and facilitate things for reformation of religion there (in Ireland), and not shut up or lock out the same. For, first, *the plantations going on*, and being principally of Protestants, cannot but unite the other party in time. And His Majesty's care in placing good Bishops and good Divines, in amplyfying the college there, and *looking to the education of Wards* and such like; as they are the most natural means, so are they like to be the most effectual and happy, for the weeding out of Popery without using the temporal sword."—Cabala, p. 36.

College, Dublin, from the 12th to the 18th year of his age.”* It must not be supposed, however, that the establishment of the court of wards by James I. was the first attempt on the faith of the upper classes of the Irish. Elizabeth’s settled plan was, under one excuse or another, to have the heirs of important Irish families brought to London to be educated in “civility” and Protestantism; and she kept Meyler Magrath there, the ex-friar and Protestant Bishop, because he could speak to them in their own tongue. James continued the same course up to the re-establishment of the Court of Wards, two years before which I find the following entry in the calendar of State Papers:—

“List of the noblemen’s sons to be brought into England for their education:—The Lord Barry’s grandchild, 13 years old; the Lord Viscount Gormanston’s eldest son of 10 years old, the Lord Coursie’s two sons, the Lord of Delvin’s son and heir, 13 years old; the Lord of Trambleston’s son and heir, 18 years old; the Lord of Dunboyne’s grandchild, 13 years old; the Lord of Cahyr’s nephew, which is son unto his brother, Thomas Butler; the Lord Power himself, 15 years old; the Lord of Birmingham’s grandchild, 14 years old; to be brought up at the free school in Dublin.”†

And further on in the calendar I find this entry in a list of concordatums:—“12 February, 1617, to Wm. Kinge, gent., for his travel charges and carriage into England, with Brian O’Rourke, His Majesty’s ward, whose delivery there the Lords of the Privy Council have certified, wishing the said William Kinge to be recompensed for the trust.”‡ In a note by Mr. Lemon this O’Rourke is pronounced “a troublesome fellow,” for although he was taken to England “to be brought up in religion, and to have that education as is meet for a gentleman of his fashion and means,” he seems to have been more inclined to fight than to learn, for on a certain St. Patrick’s day “he fell into a brabble wherein some were hurt, and O’Rourke thereupon committed to the gate house” (a prison); he was afterwards indicted in the King’s Bench and fined £300 in “charges and damages about a broken pate.”§ In the commission granted 6th September, 1622, to Sir William Parsons, to be master of the court of wards there are articles and instructions annexed from which we learn that—“No grant of any wardship was to be made to *any recusant*. That the wards were to be brought up in learn-

* 12 Jan. 13th, [year of the king’s reign] Patent Rolls, James I. p. 311.

† Calend. of State Papers (Ireland), 1615-1625, p. 83.

‡ Calendar, p. 195.

§ Ibid p. 265.

ing in the college near Dublin (Trinity), and that no ward was to be allowed to *marry a recusant*.*

George the 16th Earl of Kildare (commonly called the fairy Earl) was the first Leinster Geraldine who was regularly brought up a Protestant; but as two of his predecessors are sometimes spoken of as Protestants, I will dispose of them before proceeding with the case of the fairy Earl.

In the second edition of the "Earls of Kildare" it is stated that the eleventh Earl "conformed to the Protestant religion in the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth,"† but this statement is omitted in the subsequent and enlarged edition of 1862. The omission, however, would not warrant us in regarding it as incorrect, for, most certainly, it would never have been made unless the noble author found it among the family documents. The change in the Earl's religion must have been quietly managed, and probably consisted in his attendance at Protestant service. Be this as it may, there are incidents in his career during Elizabeth's reign which lead to the supposition that, in government circles at least, he was regarded as a Protestant. For instance in the sixth year of her reign, he, together with the Archbishop of Armagh and several other prelates and distinguished laymen, was appointed on a commission to "enquire into any heretical opinions, seditious books, conspiracies, false rumours, tales, slanderous words or sayings, published or invented by any person or persons against Her Majesty or the laws or statutes of the realm;.....and to enquire, order, correct, and reform all such persons as should obstinately absent themselves from church and Divine service, as by law established;.....to hear and determine all causes and complaints of those who, in respect of religion or lawful matrimony, have been injuriously deprived, defrauded or despoiled of their lands, goods, possessions, or livings; to ensure their restoration and the removal of the usurpers with all convenient speed;.....and as there are still in the realm divers perverse and obstinate persons, who refuse to acknowledge Her Majesty's prerogative and to observe the ceremonies and rites in Divine Service, established by law, Her Majesty directs the Commissioners to cause all Archbishops, Bishops, and other ecclesiastical officers or ministers to subscribe the oath contained in the statute, 'for restoring to the crown the antient jurisdiction over the state, ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolition of all foreign power repugnant to the same,' and

* Calendar 1619-1625, p. 391.

† *The Earls of Kildare and their Ancestors*, by the Marquis of Kildare, p. 214. 2nd. Ed. 1858.

if any of the clergy peremptorily and obstinately refuse to take the oath, their refusal is to be certified into Chancery without delay.* It is highly improbable that the Queen would have appointed the eleventh Earl upon such a commission as the above, unless she regarded him as a Protestant.

2. In the Queen's letters on Irish affairs she seemed glad of an opportunity to praise "her cousin Kildare," and certainly favoured him even when there was strong evidence brought against him.

In his intercourse with English officials the Earl sometimes spoke of the Catholic religion with suspicious contempt. In the indictment drawn up against him by the Archbishop of Dublin and the Council, he is represented as saying in an interview with the Archbishop:—"I knowe not what to doe, nor whom to truste. They are all suche arrant Papistes, and in their case I dare not truste my sonne-in-lawe here the Baron of Delvyn, he is so infected with the papistre."† Again: In the Earl's examination taken in the tower of London, 18th June, 1582, he says, "he knowethe not Rochforth the priest, neyther hathe he to his Exam^{ts}. knowledge bene at any time in his company, but he saith he hathe hard of such a one, a notable papyst and a great rebell, to have been in company of the Vycount" [Baltinglas].

3. His Will, which is given in the Second Edition of the "Earl's of Kildare," throws no light on his religious belief, and seems to be worded with the design of leaving it doubtful. "I bequethe," he says, "my sowle to Almighty God, my bowels to be buried heere in England, and my bodie to be conveide into Ireland, and there buried in St. Bryde's church in Kildare, *in such due order as appertayneth to one of my vocation.*" St. Brigit's of Kildare was, at the time of his death in the hands of the protestants; and the above italicised passage (italicised by me, not by the Earl) seems to empower the then possessors of "Kildare's Holy Shrine" to do what they pleased relative to his obsequies; while at the same time it might well have seemed to free his living relations from all responsibility in the matter. There are no symptoms of Catholicity in the Earl's Will—no prayers for his soul—no Masses; neither is there any profession of protestant belief.

I cannot think that the Earl passed or wished to pass as a protestant in Ireland, at least amongst the Irish. For although the

* Patent and Close Rolls, Chancery, Ireland; 6th of Elizabeth, pp. 489-90.

† "Earls of Kildare." Ed. 1862, p. 166.

charges brought against him by his enemies—the Allens and others—were probably much exaggerated, they must have had some foundation in fact; otherwise, his patron, Queen Elizabeth, would never have consented to the arrest of himself, and his two sons, nor to the long imprisonment to which they were subjected. To be sure, after searching examinations, both of the Earl himself and of the witnesses against him, he was restored to liberty, because, as Lord Burleigh said, “there falleth out no one poynt sufficiently proved by two witnesses concurring in time, place and matter, though otherwise the presumptions and conjectures were verie vehement against the said Erle.”* But the Earl had something still better than Burleigh’s decision to rely upon; he had the Queen’s favour, and only he had, Burleigh would have never gone into such special pleading to free him. If they wanted to hang or behead him, as they had done with his ancestors, Burleigh was just the man to maintain the evidence abundant for the purpose. The mass of evidence against him, the Earl met by denying its truth, or, as Burleigh put it—“in his own examinations he confesseth nothing in effect, but stands rather upon flatt denial.”† Of course the Earl gave the charge brought against him a flat denial; he would have played the fool had he not done so; and the truth is, the evidence was set aside merely on the strength of that denial.

Still, the conduct of his own followers, as well as that of the Catholics, chiefs and people, tend to prove that he was not regarded by them as a genuine protestant. If he were they would, in all likelihood, have received him in a manner far different from what they did. His own people, instead of raising a shout of joy on his return amongst them, would have treated him as the young Earl of Desmond was treated by his followers, when they saw him go to the protestant church with the Lord Deputy on the Sunday after his arrival in Kilmallock. It is beyond doubt that the Lady Mabel, his wife, harboured priests, and whilst from politic motives the Earl would keep such a distance with them as not to have any formal knowledge of their presence in his house, which might be used as evidence against him, he could not be wholly ignorant of the circumstance.

After Viscount Baltinglass had joined the O’Moores and O’Connors in their rebellion against Elizabeth, he sent a letter from O’Maile to the Earl of Kildare in which the following

* “The Earls of Kildare,” Ed. 1862, p. 224. Ib. 253.

† Ibid. p. 167.

passage occurs :—" I truste, therefore, the day shall never come that strangers shall saye when Christes banner was in the field, on the one syde, and the banner of heresie on the other syde, that the Earl of Kildare's forces weare openly seene to stand under the hereticall banner."* Baltinglass would scarcely have written in such terms to a man whom he believed had given up the Catholic religion.

In any case it is difficult to credit the Earl with a change of internal conviction. He was well over thirty years of age when Elizabeth ascended the throne, and not only was he a Catholic in Edward's and Mary's time, but he had been during all his previous life a representative, an impersonation of Irish Catholicity. He cannot be regarded in any other light than that of a political protestant; for the idea of theological investigation on his part, and consequent change of religion, can scarcely be entertained for a moment. He was the Catholic fugitive Geraldine everywhere; he was educated and grounded (need I say it?) in Catholic doctrine and Catholic sentiments at Rome by his great kinsman, Cardinal Pole. What a pity that he had not the courage to close with dignified consistency a career so historical, so chequered, so full of incident, so rich in romantic interest? The times no doubt were perilous, and although Edward and Mary had restored to him most of his ancestral estates, Elizabeth might have taken them back again, and taken his head along with them. The bloodstains of his five slaughtered uncles (three of whom were certainly murdered, for they were perfectly innocent) as well as those of his brother, Silken Thomas, mayhap, had not quite faded from his memory, although long obliterated from Tyburn; and it was natural that their unhappy fates should be a warning to him to bear himself with circumspection. He listened to that warning, and as it would appear, determined to follow it at any sacrifice. Leaving out of the question eternal considerations, the sacrifice he made seems great even from a human point of view. He, instead of the sixteenth Earl, should be regarded as the fairy Earl. While yet a child, and the last representative of his great house, a savage King, brutal and bloodthirsty, determined on the annihilation of his race; but he was spirited away from Ireland in spite of the ceaseless watchfulness of English detectives, (who would be promoted and highly rewarded for his capture). Through the ever watchful faithfulness of Father Leverous, he escaped them all, and succeeded in crossing the seas; but the

* "Earls of Kildare," p. 198, Ed. 1862.

moment Henry discovered his whereabouts, he demanded him at every Court as a rebel subject, with the keen persistent ferocity of a hungry tiger pursuing his prey.* There are the most wonderful myths about him in parts of the continent, especially Belgium. He was a whole year protected under the roof of the Archbishop of Liege. Watched everywhere, pursued everywhere, he at length took refuge at Rome, within the protecting shadow of the Rock of Peter, where he was educated and supported according to his rank by Cardinal Pole and Cosmo, Duke of Florence (who made him master of his horse), until it was deemed safe for him to return to England. He appeared at the Court of Edward, where he wooed and won the daughter of Sir Anthony Brown, a lady endowed with rare virtues, and well known in our Annals, as "the Lady Mabel Kildare." Such a career! such a maimed and spoilt and broken career indeed! for take away his Catholicity, and what remains of the eleventh Earl of Kildare? History—Irish history—can never cease to regard him with interest. It may treat him as the representative of a great name and a great cause, as a courtier, a warrior, a hero of Romance; but one thing it surely can never accept him for, and that is a *bona fide* protestant.

Henry and William, the two sons of the eleventh Earl, were successively the twelfth and thirteenth Earls of Kildare. William the thirteenth Earl was drowned on his way from England, having, with some "gallant gentlemen," accompanied Essex on his journey to Ireland, after his appointment as Lord Deputy. Kildare and his friends were in a small light barque, built for speed, which was cast away in a storm during the passage. He died unmarried, and his cousin Gerald, nephew of the eleventh Earl, became fourteenth Earl of Kildare. His mother, Mabel Leigh, was an English Lady, and he seems to have been brought up entirely in England, as his father, Edward Fitzgerald, held there the post of Lieutenant of the gentlemen pensioners. There is good reason to believe that, for a part of his life at least, he professed the Protestant religion. O'Sullivan makes no doubt about it, and treats him accordingly. "He might," says that writer, "have been renowned amongst the Irish, on account of his illustrious race, by the deeds of his ancestors and his own, only that he sullied everything by degenerating from the Catholic faith." He adds, as some excuse, that "from his infancy he was brought

* See a full account of his early adventures and escapes in the "The Castle of Leixlip, by a Kildare Archæologist."

up by the English, and being imbued with their errors, never imbibed the nectar of the true religion.”*

Wishing to go to England on his private affairs in 1600, he asked and obtained a letter of introduction to Cecil from Adam Loftus, Chancellor, and Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, in which he is highly commended for his “valour, zeal, and faithfulness in the Queen’s service,” qualities Adam Loftus would have hardly believed to exist in a papist. On the 16th March, 1601, the Earl himself wrote to Cecil, bespeaking his influence with the Queen on his behalf. In that letter he says:—“My chiefest comfort is the remembrance of her Majesty’s most gracious promise to me, which assured me, at my departure, that she would do for me. I believe her words to be divine oracles, and therefore do only repose my greatest felicity in this world on her princely promise.”† On the 15th May he again wrote to Cecil, telling him that since his return to Ireland, he attended the Lord Deputy in all his journeys in the “Ranelayhes, Byrnes’ Country, Westmeath, the borders of Farkall and Ophaly,” until it pleased his Lordship to give him some companies of foot and horse “for attending the service of Ophaly and prosecuting the rebels thereabouts.” He further declares that it is his “purpose evermore to adventure his life in her Majesty’s service.”‡ In the same letter he directs Cecil’s attention to the state of the army in Ireland. He says, “the most part of the Queen’s troops are Irish,” and although he thinks them well fitted for the service, he insinuates that they are not to be trusted, and wishes the army reinforced from England. He adds:—“I speak this like an Englishman, and would be glad to be so accounted.” In June 1601, Sir George Cary, the Treasurer, wrote to Cecil that the Earl broke open “certain doores” in the Lady Mabel’s house at Maynooth, “and took away all the evidences in the closet.”§ Writing to defend his action in this matter, the Earl again parades his English leanings and loyal devotion to her Majesty. He says:—“I am humbly to beseech their Lordships for as much as my birth and education hath been in England, and that ever since I was able to bear arms, I served her Majesty, both there, about her person, and here.”||

In these passages the Earl declares as nearly as may be that he is a Protestant. He does not use that word, which possibly

* Catholic History, Ed. 1850. p. 290.

† “Earls of Kildare,” under the head of “Gerald 14th Earl.”

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid, p. 340. This was the Lady Mabel Browne, the widow of the Eleventh Earl.

|| Ibid, 341.

was unknown to him, as a term descriptive of religious belief, and one which was never used to designate the Church of England except in a loose and popular way; but when he puts prominently forward that he is of English birth, and that he wishes himself to be regarded as an Englishman, he goes all but the whole length of declaring himself a member of the Church to which the Queen belonged—the only Church which was tolerated in England, and which was and is, therefore, designated the Church of England. Moreover, at that time Englishman and Protestant were synonymous terms, as they still are in parts of Ireland. O'Daly is quoted by the noble author of "*the Earls of Kildare*" for the fact that the Earl was a Protestant. O'Sullivan, too, whose *Catholic History* was first published in 1621, nine years after the Earl's death, speaks of him as a Protestant, as we have seen above. James the 1st made numerous and extensive grants of property to the Earl in twenty-one different counties of Ireland, and in the City of Dublin. He even bestowed Abbey lands upon him, and gave him the right of presentation to several ecclesiastical livings—facts which go to show that the King believed him to be a Protestant.*

O'Sullivan assumes that the fourteenth Earl was brought up as a protestant from his infancy, but this is only an assumption. Anyhow, the following facts go to show that he was not devoid of Catholic tendencies. When he was about to be married to his second cousin, Elizabeth, daughter of Lord Delvin, the relationship being within the forbidden degrees, a dispensation was sought and obtained from Rome to permit the marriage. Only Catholics would have sought such a dispensation. It may be said, no doubt, that it was sought by the Nugents, but had they regarded him as a real protestant, it is scarcely credible that that most Catholic house would have then accepted him as a husband for a member of their family. Again, there is a strong contradiction given to the protestantism of this Earl by his rushing from Dublin to Maynooth, and sending for a priest when he felt the hand of death upon him. Furthermore, although O'Sullivan says his address to the Viceroy (given later on) did not emanate from a Catholic mind, it was far more the speech of a Catholic than of a Protestant.

* The Earl (according to Lodge) was appointed Governor of Offaley on the 31st August, 1600, but, according to the Earl himself, not till the 26th March, 1601. *Earls of Kildare*, p. 338. Ed. 1862. For this office he had an allowance of 10s. a day, and "the fee of a mare during pleasure," in lieu of which he petitioned the King "that he might have a grant to him and his heirs in fee farm of so many crown lands as amounted to £100 a year, or thereabouts." His petition was complied with, and hence the above grants. See *Lodge's Peerage*, Vol. 1., p. 100.

In the year 1611, Andrew Knox, a Scotchman, and Bishop of Orkney, was translated by the King to the see of Raphoe. "He came," says O'Daly, "entrusted with a special commission and ample powers to tear up Catholicity by the roots."* Cox, in his cunning way, says on this point, "It seems, the King and Council of England resolved to proceed effectually to the Reformation of Ireland, by making laws, and by putting those that were made in execution, and by putting that kingdom under a regular and methodical government."† Persecution at once became more active. Bishop Deveney and several priests were hunted down and executed. This persecution having provoked the Earl of Kildare, he went to the Lord Deputy and denounced it, telling him it was a principle implanted in the heart of man by nature and by nature's God, to feel sorrow at seeing the innocent overwhelmed with cruel injuries by the hands of savage men. "For myself," he said, "I feel bound in conscience to lay open to you the burthens and calamities inflicted upon this kingdom by the soldiers who have been appointed to search for and seize popish priests. The more, because I am well aware of the devotedness and perfect justice with which you have administered your government here, from which I derive the hope that the aggressions of wicked men shall be restrained; that the oppressed shall receive succour, and the good of the whole country be provided for by you."

"Now, those soldiers and other servants of the crown, accompanied by bands of robbers and low immoral wretches, who associate with them on familiar terms, under the pretence of searching for priests, traverse the rural districts—the cities—the towns—invade private houses, and enter the most private apartments in those houses, robbing and destroying; and by false accusations, and with the aid of false documents, arrest and manacle innocent people and condemn them to death; publicly sell their property, while they seize for themselves their villas, their delightful gardens, their precious furniture: to sum up their wickedness, in a word, they defile everything sacred and profane. Influenced, as they are, by incredible fury, they are utterly regardless as to whether those whom they treat in this barbarous manner have committed crime or not. The fact is, that even if all the Irish papists were priests, it would be neither honourable nor becoming to attack them with such savage rage, and that, too, in spite of the morality taught by law, by reason, by the example of our ancestors, and the customs of all other nations.

* History of the Geraldines, Translation, p. 177.

† Cox: Vol. 2., p. 16.

Wherefore, I most earnestly entreat you to apply some remedy to this plague, and to so many and such crying evils. To do so concerns the public good, which claims your first attention; it concerns you—your honour and your good name—you, to whom the government of this nation is confided; *it concerns our religion*; it concerns me, who, together with a very few other Irish, venerate the royal creed; it concerns all who profess the same, especially the king, the head, chief and defender of this religion, and the sovereign ruler of all, lest we should be regarded as enemies of the state, and be held as, and actually be, brutal, irreligious, impious, and lawless.”*

O'Daly gives an epitome of the above speech in his *Relatio Geraldinorum*, which agrees substantially with O'Sullivan's fuller report.

Sir Arthur Chichester was deeply mortified by the bold freedom with which Kildare spoke, because he felt that his words cast a censure upon himself; but he concealed his anger, and thanked Kildare for his advice, while at the same time he planned his destruction. He offered him a cup of wine in token of friendship, which he took care to have drugged with poison beforehand. The Earl being thirsty quaffed the wine freely, but scarcely had he done so, when he felt ill, and exclaimed, “I fear this wine has taken my life,” and at once, mounting his horse, rode to Maynooth, and called for a Catholic priest, with whose aid he prepared himself for death, which occurred before morning.†

On this subject O'Daly writes: “The Viceroy commended his [the Earl's] zeal and piety, and asked to his palace as a guest a man so full of ardour. The Earl had only drunk the first cup of wine when he felt that he was poisoned. Furious he left the hall in tumult, and hastening to his house at Maynooth, called a Catholic priest, confessed his sins with tears, took the holy Eucharist, and a little before day expired.”‡

“The Earl died on the 11th February, 1612, and on the 12th, the Lord Deputy, Sir Arthur Chichester, wrote to the Earl of Salisbury from Dublin Castle: ‘I doubt not but your Lordship hath heretofore heard of the Earle of Kildare's match with a

* *Translated from O'Sullivan.*

Although O'Sullivan had not the means of obtaining the precise words which the Earl addressed to the Lord Deputy, no doubt the general purport of them had got abroad. It is worthy of note that the Earl speaks as a protestant in the above discourse, yet, on the night of the day on which he uttered it, he sent for a Catholic priest to prepare him for death. This speech lets much light in upon the priest-hunters of the period.

† See O'Sullivan's *Catholic Hist.* pp. 291—2 Ed. 1850.

‡ *Relatio Geraldinorum*, p. 313, quoted in the “*Earls of Kildare*,” p. 359. Ed. 1862.

daughter of the late Delvyn's, sister to the Baron that now is ; and it may be that you have likewise heard that she did lately bare him a sonne. That which I am to tell your Lordship is of the most suddayne death of the Earle. He was here with me yesterday, untill afternoone, and then he rode to his house to Maynooth, *and having supped* he sone after felt a payne in his stomach, and so went to his chamber, and sone after fell speechlesse and so died.'''*

Leaving out the poisoning and the priest, Chichester's account of the Earl's death differs only in one important point from that of O'Sullivan and O'Daly. That point is as to *where* the Earl supped. O'Daly seems to take it for granted that he supped with the Viceroy, for he says : "At the end of his statement, the Viceroy commended his zeal and piety, and *asked to his palace as a guest* a man so full of ardour ;"† Chichester, on the other hand, takes evident and over-suspicious care to make the Earl sup at Maynooth instead of with himself, and clearly implies that it was after supping at Maynooth he first felt his illness.‡

But it was the bringing up of the Earl's heir in the protestant religion which seems to have concerned Chichester, rather than the Earl's death. For after misrepresenting it, he immediately says :—"He hath left behinde him a poore and woe-full house, his chylde in his cradle, and not manie friends of integritie and judgment to manadge his estate, or to have care of his education, in which consists the welfare and hopes of his house. *Those neerest unto him here of the religion* are the Earle of Thomonde and Sir Francis Aungiere, now Master of the Rolls. The Earle is married to a daughter of the house of Kildare, and the Master of the Rolls was married to a sister of the late Earle's. If the King's Ma^{tie.} out of his princely care of auncient noble famelyes, wyl be pleased to committ the guardianshippe of the younge Lord on anie here, I recommend them to your Lordship's remembrance as well for their wourthe as allyance. They both have requested me to have care of the chylde and the welfare of his house, and that I would move your Lordship that the benefitt of the Wardshippe might be geven to himselfe, but therein I presume not ; neither do I think it fitt that the mother be permitted to have a hand in his education, her religion considered."§

* Earls of Kildare, p. 358.

† Supra.

‡ The italics in the above passages are the Author's, not Chichester's.

§ The italics are the Author's.

This was Gerald, the 15th Earl, who was only seven weeks old at his father's death. Contrary to Chichester's suggestions, the wardship of the child was given to the Duke of Lenox, but he died in the ninth year of his age, whereupon his first cousin, George, the son of his uncle Thomas and Frances Randolph, eldest daughter of the Postmaster-General of England, became sixteenth Earl of Kildare. He succeeded to the title and estates whilst yet a child, and, at the age of eight years and nine months, was given as a ward to the Duke of Lenox, "who," says Lodge, "took care to have him educated in the Communion of the Church of England, in which the illustrious family have ever since continued."* So that Lodge, justly as it seems to me, ignores the protestantism of the eleventh and fourteenth Earls.

The 16th Earl of Kildare is popularly called the fairy Earl, but the belief in a fairy Earl of Kildare is far older than the 16th Earl's time, and this unknown one should be called the "enchanted," not the "fairy" Earl. This enchanted Earl, while reviewing his army on the Curragh of Kildare, all of a sudden disappeared, together with them, and has not since been found. But Geroid Jarla (Earl Gerald or Garret) and his army live! They are, with their arms in their hands, standing in battle array in some cave near the Curragh, or under the Rath of Mullaghmast, *and when the time is come*, some person will accidentally tread on a secret spring, which at once frees the chieftain and his army from the enchantment; they march forth armed *cap-a-pied* as they entered, *and nothing can withstand them*. Such is the myth, which proves one thing at least, the wonderful faith which the Irish people had in the family of the Geraldines.

The 16th, like the 15th Earl, was given as a ward to the Duke of Lenox, on whose death the first Earl of Cork (called, like many other successful villains, "great") actually bought the wardship from the duchess for £5000! A high figure, but the famous adventurer knew what he was about. He thus got the management of the whole Kildare property, and in due time had his daughter married to this 16th Earl. The property was greatly reduced by the Earl of Cork, and still further sunk by the 16th Earl of Kildare, his son-in-law, who was an extravagant spendthrift, and had not even one of the sterling qualities of a Geraldine in him.†

* Lodge's Peerage of Ireland, by Archdall, Vol. 1., p. 101.

† The above facts I have on the most undoubted authority, which, however, I do not feel at liberty to quote. The name Fairy Earl applied to this Earl George, appears to be a joke, founded on a portrait of him at Carton, in which he looks more like a fairy than a man.

Thus was the great family of Kildare lost to the Catholic Church in Ireland; not, however, lost to Ireland itself, for the blood of the Fitzgeralds has more than once since the days of the Fairy Earl manifested itself flowing in the old channel, and men of Irish race and Irish feeling still love to apply the time-honoured eulogy of *Hibernia Hiberniores* to the House of Geraldine.*

Although the Fitzgeralds were a greater loss to the Irish Catholics than any other leading Norman family could have been, there was one Butler whose influence on their affairs was far greater than that of any individual Geraldine, I mean that one who has come down to us as the great Duke of Ormonde. George, the sixteenth Earl of Kildare, was a child when he became a King's ward, and was given to a protestant guardian. It could not, therefore, be said that he had fallen away from the religion of his ancestors; but I fear the same cannot be said of Viscount Thurles, afterwards Duke of Ormonde. We learn from his historian, Carte, that the Duke always said he was born in London in the year 1610, but Archdall proves from an Inquisition taken at Clonmel in April, 1622, before the King's Commissioners and twelve gentlemen, residents of the Co. Tipperary, that his birth took place in 1607.† I give these dates because they have an important bearing on his change of religion. His father and mother, his sisters and all who were nearest and dearest to him, were Catholics, and he was brought up as a Catholic until he was made a Ward of King James's Court of Wards, which was done in open violation of law, for he inherited no property whatever which entitled the King to make him his Ward. The notorious and unscrupulous Parsons, then head of that Court, by some unexplained trick, had the young Lord Thurles made a Ward of it, a feat of which the said Parsons was quite proud, and of which he often afterwards boasted. It may have been a clumsy trick or no trick at all; the King was for it, and that was enough.

We find in the Patent Rolls of James the First's reign, that "James Butler, Viscount Thurles," was delivered as a ward to Richard, Earl of Desmond, by a King's letter which bears date the 26th of May, in the 21st year of the King's

* Calendar of State Papers (Ireland), 1615-1625, p. 209.

† The words of the Inquisition are:—"Predictus Thomas vicecomes Thurles, 15th die Decembris, anno dom. 1619, Obiit; et quidem Jacobus Butler, communiter vocatus dominus vicecomes Thurles, fuit filius et hæres præfati Thomæ Butler, et quod præfatus Jacobus Butler, tempore mortis, prædicti Thomæ fuit ætatis duodecim annorum et non amplius." *Quoted by Archdall.*

reign, that is the year 1623.* If we follow the Inquisition cited above and hold that Lord Thurles was born in 1607, he was at least sixteen years of age when he was entrusted to a Protestant guardian ; if we believe him to have been born in 1610, he was only in his thirteenth year at the time. He was educated as a Catholic up to that period ; and if he were sixteen years of age his religious belief must have been fully formed, but even if he were only in his thirteenth year at the date of the king's letter, one cannot help thinking that James Viscount Thurles was fairly able to judge for himself in matters of religion. At the present time the most ignorant boy who comes before a court of law is allowed the right of choosing his religion by the judges, if he have completed his fourteenth year ; hence, whichever of the above dates we elect to follow for the birth of Lord Thurles, we may justly conclude that he was not entrapped into becoming a Protestant, but that he became one when he was able to judge for himself on matters of religious belief. It might be supposed that his residence at Lambeth with Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, (into whose hands he seems to have been immediately given) would have great influence upon his religious views ; but all we are told about the Archbishop is that he sadly neglected Lord Thurles's education ; so that his residence at Lambeth Palace was not likely to make him become enamoured of Protestantism.

However the year of the Duke's birth given by the King's Commissioners in the Inquisition seems by far the more probable one, although Carte does not accept it ; but be it remembered that he confesses he never saw it. He therefore rejects it, not on its merits, but because the Duke gave him a different date, a circumstance by no means sufficient for the setting aside of

* This was Sir Richard Preston, one of the grooms of the bedchamber to James, a facile courtier, and a great favourite with his master, who had the audacity to degrade a great name by creating him Earl of Desmond. He also gave him in marriage, Elizabeth, only daughter of Thomas, tenth Earl of Ormonde, in right of whom Preston put forward a claim to the Ormonde estates, which had been settled so as to descend to the holder of that title and other heirs male of the family ; and independently of which, Earl Thomas had made abundant provision for his daughter, Lady Preston. A lawsuit was the consequence, at every step of which the King interfered in behalf of his favourite ; but the case was so plain that the judges, even in that corrupt time, had to decide against him. However, the king's wishes were not to be set aside by judges, so he reversed, by a mere act of his arbitrary will, their judgment, and decided in favour of Preston ! The Earl of Ormonde, Lord Thurles's grandfather, attempted to resist this barefaced robbery, and for doing so, James seized his whole estate and imprisoned himself in the Fleet, where he was confined during eight years, often in want of the common necessities of life ! Nor did the King ever relent. The matter was finally settled by the marriage of Lord Thurles, the heir of Ormonde, with the daughter and heir of Preston.

such a formal and important document. Indeed, Carte saw no document at all with reference to the Duke's age; he relied solely on the Duke's casual word in the matter, against which two things may be reasonably urged: (1) that men are apt to make themselves younger than they really are; and (2), that the Duke of Ormonde might have had a further reason for so doing, namely the wish not to have it known that he renounced Catholicity when he was a young man of sixteen or seventeen years of age.*

King James died in March, 1625, in the fifty-ninth year of his age. The robberies he caused and permitted to be perpetrated against his Irish Catholic subjects were:—

Confiscations in Ulster,	3,798,000	statute	acres.
Between the rivers Arklow and Slaney,	66,000	"	"
In Connaught and Clare,	385,000	"	"
The Ranelagh's &c., of which the O'Byrnes were despoiled in Wicklow, say	30,000	"	"
TOTAL,	4,279,000	"	"

Thus did James, the recreant son of the martyred Catholic Mary Stuart, cause to be forfeited to the Crown, between four and five millions of acres, simply and solely because they were the property of Irish Catholics; and besides this, he made many and most galling additions to the already Draconic Penal Laws.

* Carte says, (p. 3, vol. 1.) that he sought in vain for the Inquisition in the Evidence Room in the Castle of Kilkenny, and "in the Rolls of Chancery at Dublin." There is a marginal note very quaintly, but very neatly written opposite this passage in the author's copy of Carte's Ormonde, to this effect:—"The Inquisition now remains on record in the Rolls Office, and fixes his birth in ye year of 1607." This note ought to settle the controversy.

CHAPTER VII.

CHARLES, the third and only surviving son of James the 1st, succeeded to his father. He was generally believed to be favourable to the Church of Rome, and this belief filled the Protestants with alarm, and inspired the Catholics with confidence. Hence, in the beginning of his reign, although the penal laws enacted in previous reigns remained in force, the Irish Catholics carried on their religious services with a certain amount of publicity and solemnity, thereby showing a reliance on the new monarch, for which there was no real ground, whilst it provoked the active hostility of their enemies. On his accession, Charles, found himself involved in a war with Spain, which, from his having failed to obtain the hand of the Infanta, was by no means distasteful to him, and was in fact promoted and encouraged by him and his favourite, Buckingham. During its progress he feared the Spaniards would make a descent upon the coast of Ireland, and he therefore resolved to increase his army in that country to 5,000 foot and 500 horse. He had no difficulty in getting the men, but the funds to support them were wanting, as the English parliament would allow him little or no assistance but upon hard and dishonourable terms.* The Lord Deputy of Ireland, Lord Falkland, in this difficulty, called together the chief landowners, who readily promised to raise for the King a large sum of money in return for certain concessions; and a deputation from them proceeded to London to arrange with the English Privy Council the nature and extent of those concessions. A report was at once spread abroad that they were chiefly if not entirely intended to secure toleration to the Catholic Recusants, who formed two-thirds of the meeting which had been convened by the Lord Deputy.

The founder of low-churchism in its fiercest aspect in Ireland, James Usher, was protestant primate. He summoned the protestant bishops to his house, that they might take united action against any concession being granted to the Catholics. They drew up and signed a document which they called "The judgment of divers of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland con-

* Sir E. Walker's *Historical Discourses*, fol. 337.

cerning toleration of Religion." This judgment was that "the religion of Papists is superstitious and idolatrous; its doctrines erroneous and heretical, and their Church in regard to both apostatical. To give them toleration would, therefore, be a grievous sin in two respects:—1. It would make us accessory to their superstitions, idolatries, and heresies, and to all the abominations of popery, and also to the perdition of the people who perish in the deluge of the Catholic Apostacy. 2. To grant them toleration in respect of any money to be given by them is to set religion to *sale*, and with it the souls of the people whom Christ Our Saviour redeemed with his most precious blood."

It is very remarkable and very absurd to find those champions of the divine right of private judgment speaking with the dogmatic authority of a general Council, whose decrees they would have despised and denounced with indignant contempt.*

But the King wanted an army, and as even kings cannot raise armies, without money, Charles gladly accepted the offer of £120,000 tendered by the delegates; a larger sum than had been ever given to any of his predecessors. It was to be paid within three years, in three instalments of £40,000 each. In return for this, he, under his own hand, granted the delegates fifty-one "Graces," as these concessions were called.

It seems to be assumed by protestant writers that all or almost all the "Graces" were concessions to the Irish Catholics; but this was by no means the case, for by far the greater number of them applied to the whole population, Protestant as well as Catholic. The first four had reference to the army, and were meant to relieve the people, to some extent at least, from the dreadful tyranny of coin and livery; the next eight regulated wine and beer licences, and the salaries of market clerks, settled something about tanning leather, and *abolished* short ploughs. It is only when we reach the fifteenth "grace" we find the *first* concession to the Catholics, by which they were allowed to sue out livery for their lands by taking a civil oath, which Catholics

* According to Bishop Mant's "History of the Church of Ireland," there were twenty-one Protestant bishops holding Irish Sees at the time this judgment was delivered; but it is signed by twelve only, namely:—

1. James Usher, Armagh.
2. Malcolm Hamilton, Cashel.
3. Anthony Martin, Meath.
4. Thomas Ram, Ferns and Loughlin.
5. Robert Echlin, Down and Connor.
6. George Downham, Derry.
7. Richard Boyle, Cork, Cloyne, and Ross.

8. A. Hamilton, Killala, and Achonry.
9. Thomas Moygue, Kilmore and Ardagh.
10. T. Buckworth, Dromore.
11. Michael Boyle, Waterford and Lismore.
12. Francis Gough, Limerick.

could take, instead of the oath of supremacy, which they might not take without being guilty of apostacy. This "Grace" also allowed Catholic lawyers to practise in the Courts of Law. Then come some ameliorations for the Court of Wards, which were of general application, and the fees of the Law Courts are dealt with. By the twenty-fourth "Grace," granted "for the better settling of our subjects in that Kingdom" [Ireland], the search into title is limited to sixty years—a grace in favour of the "undertakers" as well as of the ancient inhabitants. The twenty-fifth grace was an important one, for it gave permission, *once again*, to the plundered inhabitants of Clare and Connaught to have their properties enrolled in Chancery, and thereby escape the confiscation already pronounced against them, as related at page 56; and the fees they had previously paid in were to be placed to their credit in this new settlement. The next "Grace" having any special application to the Catholics was the forty-ninth, which says, "No extraordinary warrants of assistance touching clandestine marriages, christenings or burials, or any contumacies pretended against ecclesiastical jurisdiction are to be issued by the Lord Deputy, or by any other governors, nor executed." This appears to be intended to allow priests to exercise some of their functions, without being obliged to submit to "the severe demands" of the protestant clergy.* The fiftieth is for the relief of outlaws whose outlawry has been reversed. The fifty-first and last "Grace" regarded the tenure of land, and affects Protestants as well as Catholics.

Thus do we find in Charles's fifty-one "Graces," or concessions, only four or five specially framed for the relief of the Catholics.

* By a schedule of tithes or ecclesiastical dues there were payable *Easter offerings, clerk's wages, dues for christening, for churching of women, marriages, mortuaries*, which meant tithes of the goods left by deceased persons, *privy tithes*, which were dues payable by tradesmen, sellers of small wares, &c., tithes on *milk and calves, on lambs, kids, and pigs, on foals, on eggs*. The rating of eggs is curious, it is, for every *hen* two eggs to be paid at Easter, and for every *cock* three. There were dues for *mills, for gardens, dues on herbage, and things payable in kind, such as all sorts of corn, peas, beans, apples and all other kinds of fruit, flax, hops, wood under twenty years growth, turf, honey, wax, wool, pigeons, rabbits, geese, ducks and other fowl, fishes of all sorts, &c.* The various things titheable numbered at least to *three score*. *Patent and Close Rolls, Charles I. pp. 551 & 552.* Exhaustive as the list of tithes and church dues claimable by law seems to have been, the protestant clergy were not content with it, but exacted dues for services which they could not or would not discharge. The Parliamentary Committee, which presented a Remonstrance of Grievances to the King, says: "Of their own knowledge [those grievances] were so clever and manifest that no place was left for denial of proof. Part of those recited in their journals are the scandalous extortions of the ecclesiastical courts for *old papistic rites and customs, condemned and renounced by those very persons who then so greedily exacted the profits formerly annexed to them, which it seems they still deemed orthodox.*" *Curry's Civil Wars, Vol. 1., p. 169.*

Many of the other "Graces" were of much value to the Kingdom at large, and well calculated to advance prosperity, but Usher and the other protestant prelates elected to forego those advantages, rather than that the Catholics should obtain any portion of that religious liberty, which protestants so ostentatiously claim as the unalienable right of all Christians; and an essentially necessary claim it is for them to put forward, inasmuch as the Reformers who rebelled against Rome had no other possible principle upon which to rest that rebellion; but what becomes of it when their successors, who pretend to stand by it, turn persecutors for conscience sake?

The bishops, who met at Primate Usher's, express their virtuous indignation at the bare idea of granting toleration to the papists in respect of any money to be given by them for the King's service. To do so, they say, would be "to set religion to sale, and with it the souls of the people whom Christ our Saviour redeemed with his most precious blood." What suitable name can we give this high sounding cant, when it is declared by the weightiest protestant authorities, that those very same bishops knew perfectly well that the Livings in the protestant church, that suits in the Ecclesiastical Courts, that, in short, everything, which ought to be held sacred, was bought and sold in the most public and shameful manner. "In these Courts [the protestant Ecclesiastical Courts] bribes," says Bishop Burnet, "went about almost barefaced; and the exchange they made for money was the worst sort of simony."* It was notorious that the meeting of bishops at Usher's house was convened by Usher himself, and most probably their "Judgment," quoted above, was drawn up by him; yet bishop Bedel told the self-same Primate Usher that, "whereas he [Bedel] was wont to except one of these [Ecclesiastical] Courts [meaning the Primate's] from the general corruption, yet he heard it was said among great personages, that his Grace's Court was as corrupt as others; some said it was worse; and that of his Grace's late visitation they saw no profit but the taking of the money."† Even Cox, the champion of the English and protestant cause in Ireland, thus writes: "Nor was the beauty of the protestant church sullied by its avowed enemies only; it was more defaced by its pretended friends and members. Things sacred were exposed to sale in a most sordid and scandalous manner; parsonages and episcopal Sees impoverished, and their revenues were alienated

* Burnet's Life of Bishop Bedel, p. 81, 2nd Ed.

† Ibid.

and encumbered to that degree, that both the bishoprics of Kilmore and Ardagh were not sufficient to support a bishop that would not use indirect means to get money; and the churches were generally out of repair.”* So much for the “Judgment” of the twelve bishops and their simulated horror of putting to sale *things sacred*.

The Delegates, who waited on Charles in England, carried back with them the fifty-one “Graces,” together with instructions to Falkland, the Lord Deputy, to summon a Parliament, in order that these “Graces” might be stamped with its approval. He at once obeyed the King’s commands and issued the writs, but in doing so, omitted an essential condition, and this made the writs illegal. He did not comply with Poyning’s law, which required that “no Parliament be holden in Ireland until the acts be certified into England.” That is: the acts for the consideration of which the parliament was summoned should be previously submitted to the King and Privy Council, and when “affirmed by the King and his Council to be good and expedient for Ireland, *and his licence thereupon*” given, they were sent back to Ireland, when alone they could be legally submitted to the Irish Parliament. This law not having been complied with by Lord Falkland, the writs issued by him were of no value. Some very suspicious mystery hangs over this affair. Surely, the King, or at least his Privy Council, and if not either of these, Falkland or his advisers in Ireland, knew full well that a compliance with Poyning’s law was an essential condition to the legality of the parliament; yet it was not attended to. Further still; the oversight, if it were such, could have been easily remedied, inasmuch as the instructions for the summoning of this parliament were sent to Ireland in May, and in those instructions the third of the following November was named for the assembling of the parliament—a period which afforded ample time to rectify the error. But nothing was done. Leland’s observations on this matter are very just. He says: “Whether the irregularity were casual or premeditated, nothing could have been corrected more easily and readily, if Charles had been sincerely disposed to give effectual relief and satisfaction to his Irish subjects. Yet no new writs were issued; nor any time assigned for a legal and regular convention of the Irish Parliament.”†

No parliament was convened and the Graces remained unconfirmed; yet, the Catholics, although much disappointed,

* Sir Richard Cox’s *Hibernia Anglicana*, Vol. 2, p. 53.

† Leland’s *History of Ireland*, Vol. 2, p. 487. Quart. Ed.

clung to the belief that so important a state paper as that conceding the Graces could not be allowed to remain a dead letter. Meantime the Puritans got up an exciting agitation about the Graces, and they were denounced from every pulpit in Ireland, as intolerable and exclusive concessions to the papists. The same was said of them in England. We have seen how very unfounded this view was, but it served party purposes for the time. Thorough protestant writer as Dr. Leland was, he says of them that they were "such as in general were evidently reasonable and equitable, calculated for the redress of those grievances which persons of all denominations had experienced, and tending to the peace and prosperity of the whole nation."* And another protestant historian writes:—"It is manifest that those articles [the Graces] were not only founded in equity, but in policy; that they were well calculated to tranquillize the nation, by securing the blessings of good government."† The "Graces" remained in abeyance, but the agitation which they had occasioned among the protestants rose so high, that the Lord Deputy (Faulkland), pressed by it, and urged by the Privy Council, in less than a year after the granting of them, published a Proclamation against popish ecclesiastics, whom he charged and commanded in "his Majesty's name to forbear the exercise of their popish rites and ceremonies."

To Faulkland's honour be it said that he took little or no pains to have this proclamation put in force, for he "was not the man to carry into execution the dishonest projects of the English Council."‡ Not so his successors, the Lords Justices, who being "exceedingly zealous against Popery," immediately directed that the Papists should be prosecuted for not coming to church; but this order was, for the time, countermanded from England.§ The Catholics paid at least nine-tenths of the free subsidies granted to the King; yet the Protestants were, or affected to be, much provoked at having to pay any portion at all of them, and kept agitating and asserting that the true way to provide supplies for the army was to fine the Papists for absenting themselves from the Protestant service. The king did not come entirely into their view, as Wentworth, who had become all-powerful with him, was opposed to it for reasons given hereafter; but reluctance to pay the subsidies having been openly expressed by the Catholics, seeing that they never

* Hist. of Ireland, Vol. 1, p. 483.

† Taylor's Civil Wars, Vol. 1, p. 250.

‡ Cox, Vol. 2, p. 53.

§ Lingard, vol. 7. p. 200.

|| Cox, vol. 2. p. 54.

received any of the promised Graces, it was thought politic to terrify them by allowing the persecution to proceed, and so frighten them into continuing the subsidies.

Through the incessant intrigues of Usher and the Puritans, Faulkland was recalled, and Adam Loftus, Viscount Ely, and Richard, Earl of Cork, were appointed Lords Justices in October, 1629. On St. Stephen's day in that year there was High Mass in the Franciscan Church in Cook Street, Dublin, such being the usual devotion on solemn festivals. At the same time the Lords Justices were in Christ's Church, hard by, at the Protestant service. The devotions in Cook Street having been notified to their Lordships, "they sent the Archbishop of Dublin, the Mayor, Sheriffs, and Recorder of the City, with a file of musketeers to apprehend them (the priests engaged in the function), which they did, taking away the crucifixes and paraments of the altar; the soldiers having cut down the image of St. Francis, the priests and friars were delivered into the hands of the pursuivants."* The people having recovered from the first shock of this astounding outrage, rushed after the Archbishop, Dr. Bulkeley and his *posse comitatus*, rescued the priests, and compelled the Archbishop to take refuge in a house. Reinforcements having arrived at the scene, he was rescued and protected from further peril. Eight Catholic Aldermen were imprisoned for not having assisted the Mayor in making this unprovoked attack upon their religion and its sacred ministers.

The High Mass in Cook Street was represented in England as a daring contempt of the law, and a dreadful shock to the Protestant feeling of the country. The result was that, by an order of the English Privy Council, fifteen Catholic Churches were seized for "the King's use," and the Catholic College in Back Lane, Dublin, was handed over to Trinity College, which immediately converted it into a Protestant Seminary. This revival of persecution in Dublin was afterwards extended over the whole kingdom, as well it might, for the English Privy Council informed the Lords Justices of Ireland that his Majesty in person was pleased openly in Council, and in most gracious manner, to approve and commend their ability and good service;

* Hammon L'Estrange, a cotemporary authority quoted by Curry, *Civil Wars*, Vol. 1. p. 114. The ordinary authorities say this outrage was perpetrated in a Carmelite Church. Mr. Gilbert in his *History of Dublin*, vol. 1. p. 299, informs us that both the Carmelite and Franciscan Churches were, at the time, in Cook Street, and that it was in the latter the outrage was committed; and this view is sustained by the importance attached to the destruction of the statue of St. Francis—sure to be a prominent object in a Church of his order, but which would not be usually found in a Carmelite Church at all.

whereby they might be sufficiently encouraged to go on, with the like resolution and moderation, till the work was done, as well in the city as in other places of the Kingdom, leaving to their discretion when and where to carry a *soft* or *harder hand*.*

It may be alleged now, as it was then, that Papists had violated the law, and so brought upon themselves the attack recorded above. It must be admitted that to celebrate Mass, or to assist at it was an offence punishable by a statute of the 2nd of Elizabeth, passed in her first Irish parliament, held in 1559-60. Of that parliament I have already given some account. It was not a representative body at all, having been summoned from *ten* counties only; it was not even a parliament of the Pale. Still, packed as it was, the great majority of its members were avowed Catholics, or at least Catholics at heart, who would not be likely to pass a law to punish their priests for saying Mass, or to fine or imprison themselves and their co-religionists for assisting at it, so that it is a mystery how the law was smuggled through parliament. But even accepting it as the expression of a properly constituted Irish House of Commons—which it was not,—the policy of Charles and Faulkland, his Lord Deputy (who had only just left Ireland) was a policy of toleration, so that for a considerable time this penal law had been in abeyance. Moreover, the whole proceeding took place without any regular process of law, such as was required by the statute. When news was brought to Christ's Church that Mass was being celebrated at Cook Street, the Archbishop, deserting his religious duties in his own Church, proceeds with a file of soldiers to the Catholic Church hard by, arrests the priests at the altar, and seizes the vestments and other sacred articles without showing any legal authority for the proceeding. The whole was a sudden, lawless, military raid, unconstitutional and indefensible. To be sure the Lord Mayor and some Aldermen were there, who had, I presume, authority to quell a riot, but none whatever to arrest people engaged peaceably at their devotions, much less to

* *Cabala* or *Scrinia Sacra*, 3rd Ed. p. 297. The remarkable document from which the above is taken is from "The Lords of the Council in England to the Lords of the Council in Ireland, January 31, 1639," in which the following passages also occur: "When such people [the friars] be permitted to swarm, they will soon grow licentious, and endure no government but their own." Orders are given "That the house wherein Seminary Friars appeared in their habits, and wherein the Reverend Archbishop and the Mayor of Dublin received the first affront, be speedily demolished and be the mark of terror to the resisters of authority." And further they tell them to "use all fit means to discover the founders, benefactors, and maintainers of such societies and colleges, and certify their names; and that they find out the Lands, Leases, and Revenues applied to their uses, and dispose thereof according to law."

profane and demolish the sacred furniture of the Church, like a party of lawless wreckers.

The Catholics were at last aroused to a consciousness of the position in which they stood, and of the deceptions practised upon them. The "Graces" for which they undertook the payment of £120,000 in three years were not only withheld from them, but the government had re-entered upon a course of active persecution against them. They justly complained of being obliged to pay money for which they had not got the concessions promised by the King himself; and, says Sir R. Cox with cool effrontery, "at length they gained their point, and instead of £10,000 quarterly, the government *condescended* to take £5,000 per quarter," until the *whole* £120,000 should be paid.* And this wonderful condescension was all the Catholics received for their £120,000, except indeed the Proclamation against their religion. The Lords Justices having governed Ireland for nearly four years were succeeded by the notorious Wentworth, than whom there had not been in all England a more violent opposer of the King's prerogative, or a more strenuous assertor of the people's liberties, in the earlier part of his career; but having turned over to the Court party in 1629, he was made a baron, and soon after a Viscount. He at once became the most devoted and trusted servant of Charles, working for him and promoting his designs with all the zeal of a convert. As Viscount Wentworth he was sent Lord Deputy to Ireland in 1633 was raised to the dignity of Lord Lieutenant as Earl Strafford in 1639; was cursed and hated as Black Tom by the Irish people, and finally beheaded in England, for High Treason in 1641.† He was a man of much ability, determined will, and boundless ambition.

Whilst the Catholics felt justly aggrieved at having to continue the payment of the subsidy, the protestants endeavoured to avoid paying any of it at all, maintaining, as already stated, that the

* Cox says one-third of the £120,000 would have fallen on the Protestants. Carte says the same: Life of Ormond, Vol. 1; but the Catholic Nobility and Gentry, in their Remonstrance of Grievances to the King's Commissioners at Trim in 1640, say they bore nine parts in ten in the payment of subsidies. Curry, Vol. 1, p. 113.

† Thomas, 10th Earl of Ormonde was perhaps even still more known than Wentworth as "Black Tom." He was the playmate of Edward the 6th, who delighted in his company. He was a brave soldier, a clever pliant politician, became a protestant, and was high in the favour of Queen Elizabeth, who, it is said, used to call him her "Black Husband." It was he who crushed the Earl of Desmond, for which the Queen rewarded her black husband very poorly; but he had great enemies at Court. He was blind for the last 12 years of his life. Like many other unprincipled adventurers of the time, he became a Catholic at his death. De Rothe Analecta, New Ed., p. 44.

true way to raise money to support the army was to levy off the Catholics the old fine of 12d. a Sunday for absenting themselves from the protestant service; but Wentworth set no value on this system of fines, either as a means of raising money for the King, or of compelling Catholics to turn protestants. His views on both subjects were far more radical and extensive. He had made up his mind to carry out the confiscations planned by James, which he considered a far more effective engine of proselytism than fines; and he was firmly opposed to the granting of the "Graces," as one of them, and a chief one, was a permission to the landowners of Clare and Connaught to secure to themselves legal possession of those lands which he had marked out for confiscation. His second great means for making Ireland protestant was the Court of Wards, as he felt convinced that once the rich Catholics became protestant the poorer sort would, as a matter of course, follow their example. So he revived that Court in all its activity and severity. This was a bold far-reaching policy, and if carried out "thorough," to use his own favourite word, would have finished what James had begun, namely, the rooting out of all the rich Catholics or the compelling them to become protestants. He was also opposed to subsidies as being too uncertain for supplying money for the King's service, but was content to receive the subsidy of £120,000 until he had matured his plans for securing a permanent revenue.

Wentworth summoned a Parliament to meet in July, 1634, which he had taken great pains beforehand to make subservient to his wishes. Having fully made up his mind as to the kind of Parliament he required, he with admirable dexterity matured plans to secure it. Together with the election writs he tells us that he also sent out letters recommending such candidates as he and his Council believed were "ablest and best for his Majesty's service;" endeavouring with all his power and diligence "to get the House to be composed of *quiet and governable men*;"* that is, men to be governed by him, who would submit to do his bidding, be it what it might, and to do it in the manner required by him, however mean and degrading. The Catholic element still predominated enormously. Wentworth himself says Catholics were to protestants as a hundred to one; and the persons eligible for Parliament were still mostly Catholics, except the officers and servants of the Crown. Previous Lord Deputies had endeavoured to establish protestant ascendancy in Parliament; Wentworth, although he hated the papists, was too politic to do this, he preferred to

* Straff. Letters, Vol. 1, p. 259.

have the parties pretty well balanced, with a certain number of the dependent creatures of the government in his hands, by whose aid the balance could be turned whichever way he pleased. By bullying the Sheriffs, and using, without scruple, all the power of the government, he succeeded in carrying out his design. Still the protestants were in the majority, for he says in a letter to the Secretary, "This House is very well composed, so as the protestants are the majority; and this may be of great use to confirm and settle his majesty's title to the plantations of Connaught and Ormonde; for this you may be sure of, all the protestants are for plantations, all the others are against them; so that these being the greater number, you can want no help *they* can give you therein." Quite true: for a plantation meant the robbing and rooting out of Catholic proprietors, and the giving of their lands to protestants. He further says "he considered that majority of the protestants in the House of Commons as a good rod to hold over the papists."* The protestants who constituted the actual majority, numbering 134, were chiefly or entirely dependants of the Crown, who must obey the Lord Deputy in anything and everything. These he believed to be all-important to him, for he felt that an occasion might arise when he would require a majority, even against the Protestant party, which might on some occasion or other oppose his will. His policy was to play off the two parties—Protestant and Catholic—against each other, whilst he held in his own hands a sufficient number of votes to give him a majority at whichever side he desired it. This he states in terms. "I shall labour," he says, "to make as many Captains and Officers burgesses in this Parliament as I possibly can, who having immediate dependance on the Crown, may always sway the business between the two parties which way they please."†

Wentworth not only discharged the office of a faithful servant to Charles, but that of a most subservient tool likewise, carrying out his unconstitutional projects in the face of every difficulty, and taking upon himself the entire responsibility and odium of doing so; for all which he received but poor recompense in the end, Charles having abandoned him to the fury of his many enemies. But Wentworth should have known his patron sufficiently not to be much surprised at such treacherous conduct, which was, in some sense, a just retribution on the man who had deceived and ruined so many for the sake of this weak and treacherous Stuart. Wentworth was against conceding the

* Strafford's Letters, Vol. 1, fol. 353.

† Ibid., Vol. 1, p. 247.

"Graces," chiefly because they interfered with his fixed determination to confiscate Connaught from the Catholics, and plant it with Protestants. Charles was as anxious as he to rob the Catholic proprietors of that Province, and as anxious to withhold the Graces too. Hence he writes to Wentworth that it would not "be worse for him" (Wentworth) though that Parliament's obstinacy should make him "break with them," as this would supply an excuse for refusing the Graces; "for," says Charles, "I fear that they have some grounds to demand more than it is fit for me to give:" that is, he had no scruple to break his kingly word solemnly given to his Irish subjects, when it suited his interest or convenience to do so. For all this villainy Wentworth made himself responsible. Nay more, in a spirit of the meanest falsehood, to which the proudest are often the readiest to stoop, he said to the Parliament, "Surely so great a meanness cannot enter your hearts, as once to suspect his Majesty's gracious regards of you, and performance with you, when you affie yourself upon his Grace."* For this contemptible chicanery, the King soon after thanked him in an autograph letter, saying, amongst other things, "your last dispatch has given me a great deal of contentment, and especially for the keeping off the envy of a necessary negative from me, of those unreasonable Graces that people expect from me."†

Wentworth handled the Parliament with great address, but with still greater deception. He said to them, in an apparently frank and generous spirit, that the King intended to have two sessions, one for himself, and another for them; that his majesty expected a debt of £100,000 to be discharged, and £20,000 a year, constant and standing revenue for the payment of the army; and that when they had supplied the King with this "they might be sure his Majesty would go along with them in the next meeting through all the expressions of a gracious and a good king."‡ The Parliament sat; and Wentworth, as he had said, set apart the first session for the king's business. Once again the Commons were deceived, and relying upon the word of an unscrupulous liar, voted £240,000—a sum vastly in excess of what was demanded. They drew up a Remonstrance concerning the promised graces, and especially with regard to the inquiry into defective titles, which they sent to the Lord Deputy. After some time they were summoned to the Council Chamber to receive his answer. Assuming his naturally insolent imperiousness, he told them he

* Stafford's Letters, Vol. 1, p. 68.

† Ibid., p. 331.

‡ State Letters. See Plowden's Historical Review, pp. 121-2-3.

would not send the statute of the 21st of James to England; [this was the statute regarding defective titles] but that *such refusal was his own*, their request never having been so much as sent over. Such intense lying! He had already sent the statute. He added, that passing an act to prevent inquiry into defective titles was neither good nor expedient for the kingdom, and that with this answer they must rest satisfied, as one that could not and would not be departed from. So much for that promised second session of this Parliament, which was to be specially devoted to the benefit of his people by a "good and gracious king."

Having obtained all the money he wanted, and having threatened, bullied, deceived, and lied "roundly" to the Parliament, he dismissed it, and turned at once to his favourite project of despoiling the Catholics of Connaught and planting that Province with Protestants, in the teeth of the twenty-fifth Grace, which was granted by the King, "on his royal word" and "his princely signature," as the Commons say, in the above Remonstrance.

No greyhound in sight of his prey ever panted more impatiently in the leash than did Wentworth long to rush upon the proprietors of Connaught, to chase them from the lands and homes which they had inherited from their ancestors. Immediately on the dissolution of this Parliament he applied himself to carrying out the project with a zeal thorough and hearty. There was much in his favour. Ormonde placed his whole property in Wentworth's hands, to be dealt with as the King might please, without which proceeding on Ormonde's part Wentworth confessed he could not have established the King's claim to that territory. The surrender of upper and lower Ormonde was soon followed by that of Limerick and Clare. The proprietors in these cases felt, no doubt, that if they did not yield willingly their lands would be seized; so they hoped for better terms by an early and apparently a willing surrender.

Wentworth regarded these as good examples for the Connaught proprietors, which he expected them to follow, but as they seemed not quite so pliant as he desired, he determined to overawe them; so he, accompanied by the Plantation Commissioners, proceeded to that Province, taking with them an imposing retinue, together with a military escort of five hundred horse, whom he, with grim and caustic humour called "good lookers on." "His project was no less," says Leland, "than to subvert the title to every estate in every part of Connaught, and to establish a new Plantation through the whole Province; a project which when first proposed in the late reign was received with

horror and amazement, but which suited the undismayed and enterprizing genius of Lord Wentworth.* He knew well enough that the King had no real title to the lands of Connaught any more than he had to Ormonde. He therefore rejoiced exceedingly when the head of the House of Butler placed his large possessions at the King's disposal, which he mainly did through fear of faring worse by resistance than by submission. He was also, without doubt, strenuously urged to it by Wentworth, whose bosom friend he had become. "Where our title was borrowed, or at least supported by my Lord Ormonde, and indeed *could not have stood alone upon the King's evidence*. I am most confident we shall have like success in Clare."† The title to Connaught was not a whit better than the title to the Ormonds, but there was no great leading man in Connaught inclined to do for the Lord Deputy what Lord Ormonde did for him in the South. He therefore resolved to carry Connaught by a mixture of deceit and audacity. When he arrived at Boyle great fears and consternation prevailed there, which he at once saw the necessity of allaying; so he assembled the chief men of the surrounding country, and addressed them in one of his most characteristic speeches. His reasons for choosing not only the chief men, but the wealthiest for juries, who were to make inquisition as to the title of the King in Connaught are given by himself, and are admirable in their way. Before his Lordship left Dublin, to hold his court of inquisition in Connaught he had given orders to his managers there, that gentlemen of the best estates and understandings, in the different counties, should be returned on the juries which were to be held in the first trials of defective titles. This he did, not—as one might imagine—on a supposition of their greater knowledge, integrity or honour, but because, as he says himself,‡ "this being a leading case for the whole Province, it would set a value, in their estimation, upon the goodness of the King's title, if found by those persons of quality." And on the other hand, if the King's title should not be found, or as he expresses it, "if the jury should prevaricate," he would be sure then to have "persons of such means as might answer to the King in a round fine in the Castle Chamber;" and because the fear of that fine would be apter to produce the desired effect in such persons than in others, who had little or nothing to lose.§

* Leland, vol. 3, p. 30.

† State Letters, vol. 2, p. 93.

‡ State letters, vol. 1, p. 442.

§ Curry's Civil Wars, Vol. 1, p. 150-1.

To the gentlemen of quality and of the best estates, assembled at Boyle, Wentworth said that he had come "to execute his master's commission, for finding a clear and undoubted title in the Crown to the Province of Connaught." That being his commission, one should suppose there was little room for investigation, examination, or legal proceedings of any kind; but in order to delude his hearers, and give some colour of law to his spoliations, he assured them it was "his Majesty's gracious pleasure that every man's counsel should be fully and willingly heard in defence of his rights; and his Majesty had further enjoined him," he said, "to afford his good people all respect and freedom, in the setting forth and defence of their several rights and claims."* How Wentworth must have laughed in his sleeve at his wicked duplicity, he frankly tells us himself, for he adds:—"With this I left them marvellously well satisfied, for a few good words please them more than can be imagined."†

Some lawyers were heard on both sides, but this was merely for form sake, and to play the comedy out. The jury behaved rather well, Wentworth said, especially Sir Lucas Dillon, the Foreman; yet he felt bound to give them a bit of his mind, after the lawyers were done speaking. He therefore told them "his Majesty was indifferent whether they found for him or no; for that he had directed him to press nothing upon them, where the path to his right lay so open and plain before them." Still, he (Wentworth) "on account of the vast affection he entertained for them and their nation," advised them "to descend into their own consciences," where, he was convinced, "they should find the evidence for the Crown clear and conclusive." But the excellent Lord Deputy, for fear of mistakes, was thoughtful enough to give them a light to guide them in this examination of conscience, which was, that unless they found the King's title, as he advised, they should feel the full weight of his anger; a thing, as they well knew, not to be lightly provoked. If they loved truth, he said, and wished to do the best for themselves, they would, as a matter of course, find the King's title to Connaught to be, beyond all dispute, perfect; but on the other hand, if they were passionately determined to follow their own wills "without respect at all for their own good," he, with charming frankness, advised them not to find any title at all. How he chuckled over this touch of cleverness! For he adds—"and there I left them to chaunt together, as they call it, over their

* Stafford, *State Letters*, vol. 1, p. 444.

† Ibid.

evidence, and the next day they found the King's title without scruple."*

Sligo and Mayo, cowed by the highhanded proceedings of the Lord Deputy in Roscommon, also found for the King's title.

In Galway, the Lord Deputy did not find such timid and pliant jurors as in the other counties. Galway was almost entirely Catholic, and relied very much on the power and influence of the House of Clanrickard to sustain them in resisting the barefaced and wholesale robbery which was being perpetrated in their province, not so much through cunning forms of law as by an utter contempt of all law and all justice.† The Galway Jury refused to declare that the King had a right to seize, as his own, their long inherited and careful properties. Wentworth was furious, and at once determined to inflict utter ruin upon them. He fined the Sheriff £1,000 for having returned what he called a "packed" jury; and as to the jurymen, they were handed over to the Castle-Chamber (the Star-Chamber of Ireland), by which they were fined £4,000 each (what a sum in those days!); their estates were seized, and they themselves cast into prison till the fines should be paid; nay more, besides paying the fines, they were also bound, before being liberated, to acknowledge their offence in open court on bended knees.‡ Not only were the Galway jurors consigned to utter destruction but the whole county was treated with exceptional severity. The general rule in this plantation was, that one-fourth of the land should be taken from the native owners, and an increased rent put upon the remainder, but on account of the "prevarication" of the Galway Jury, they were deprived of one-half instead of one-fourth of their lands.§

One touch more and we have done with this picture of Black Tom's Plantation of Connaught: it is this, that judges, who sat in judgment on the unfortunate proprietors, were openly bribed by him for their verdicts! and that, too, by the King's permission! for he, Wentworth, obtained authority to bestow four shillings in the pound upon the Lord Chief Justice and the Lord Chief Baron, out of the first year's rent raised upon the land

* Ibid.

† The Clanrickard of the time was a very important personage, the same who was afterwards Lord Deputy. He was a zealous Catholic, and is said to have been a man of strong religious feelings. Clarendon, Carte, and Castlehaven speak of him in the highest terms.

‡ Leland, Vol. 3, p. 32.

§ By some interference this was changed to one-fourth, the same as the rest of the province. "Prevarication" and "prevaricate" and their modifications, were, like "thorough," favourite words with Wentworth.

adjudged to the King by the Commission of defective titles. This he, like a brave and hardy villain, says, "he found upon observation, to be the best given that ever was; for, that by these means they did intend that business with as much care and diligence as if it were their own private; and that every four shillings, over paid, would better his Majesty's revenue four pounds."* What a courageous, a frank, heroic, and withal charming villain was not the notorious black Tom Wentworth!

* Strafford's State Letters, Vol. 2, p. 465.

CHAPTER VIII.

RETROSPECT.

OVER one hundred years (1535 to 1640) had passed from the time George Browne took possession of the See of Dublin to the close of Wentworth's administration in Ireland. Before we enter on the great struggle which commenced in 1641, let us glance back upon that period. George Browne represents the beginning of the religious innovation which arose chiefly from the King's passionate wish to divorce his lawful wife, Catherine of Arragon, but partly from that headstrong, arrogant disposition of his, which would brook no contradiction where his interests and his passions were engaged. Henry never was a protestant in the true and accepted sense of that word. He seized the spiritual supremacy rather to spite the Pope than to found a new religion, but having once broken away from the Catholic Church, a return to it became, day after day, more difficult, on account of his unbridled licence, the advice of parasites who were profiting by the change, and his own extravagance, which emptied the treasury, and drove him to suppress and rob the religious houses. Still, Henry's conduct with regard to the supremacy gave rise to as sharp a religious controversy as if he had denied all the articles of the Nicene Creed. He had considerable success in bending the minds of the English people to his views, but in Ireland his claim to the spiritual headship was met by the most determined resistance. Browne of Dublin and Staples of Meath were the only prelates who laboured to carry out his wishes here, but their labours were thrown away upon an "ungrateful people," as those prelates themselves declared; and Browne assured his Majesty that his (Browne's) "temporal life" was in continual danger, because he endeavoured to serve his Majesty; and of the people, he wrote to the King, that they were more zealous in their blindness than the saints and martyrs were in the truth at the beginning of the Gospel.

The religious situation in Ireland underwent no noteworthy change during Edward's short reign, whilst in Mary's still shorter one, persecution of Catholics ceased, but an exterminating war was carried on against the native Irish, much the same as it had been in previous reigns.

Elizabeth and her astute advisers planned laws, and had them enacted, well calculated to apply the royal reforming axe to the root of popery in Ireland. In her first Irish Parliament, which met the year after she had come to the throne, the law regarding the oath of supremacy was so much extended that no clergyman could receive holy Orders and no heir could inherit his property without taking it. Thus was abolished (1) the power of ordaining priests in Ireland; and thus (2) was the rule established that no one, without renouncing his faith, no Catholic, could inherit property to which he was the undoubted, undisputed heir; and thus were the Catholics of Ireland compelled, as far as law could compel them, to become protestants, or to fight the battle of their religion at fearful odds. Every landed proprietor must become a protestant or a beggar; so that all who had capacity and position to be leaders of the people were, of necessity, to be lost to them within a single generation. By the Queen's scheme for the plantation of Munster, the whole people of that province were to be annihilated, for it not only disqualified the natives [Catholics] from retaining any of the land in their possession, but it expressly forbade the English, to whom the land was made over, to retain them as servants, or work people, or *in any capacity whatever*. This diabolic plan did not succeed to the full measure of the wishes or expectations of Elizabeth, but it was not through any fault of hers, for her full determination was that Munster should become English and Protestant in seven years; and if it did not, the cause arose from the difficulty of getting English to settle in Ireland, and also from the brave and determined resistance of the disinherited people. And let it not be supposed that it was for their lands only the people fought; they fought quite as much, if not more, for their religion, as their treatment of the young Earl of Desmond, when they saw him going to the protestant worship, and as many other incidents of the period, abundantly prove.

Some English writers, to suit their own views, assume that the Irish of that period had no religion, or next to none. There is plenty of evidence to show the falsehood of this; although the opportunity of giving the people complete or regular instruction was to a great extent taken away by their being so long engaged in wars, defending their lives, their liberties and their property. Later on, the opportunity of imparting instruction was rendered still more difficult by those inhuman statutes which deprived them of their religious teachers. To hang the schoolmaster, as the English did in Ireland, and then charge the people with ignorance, is cool effrontery indeed. In spite of persecution, however, they had quite enough knowledge to feel,

that by adhering to the Church of Rome they were adhering to the true church—the church of their fathers—the Church which St. Patrick had founded, and that by opposing the new doctrines which the Sovereigns of England tried to force upon them, knew they were rejecting a heresy which they believed would destroy their hopes of salvation.* Besides, the Irish were not so ignorant in the remotest parts of the kingdom, where they were still free to learn, as they were in the neighbourhood of the English towns, where it was certain death for a priest to be found.

The Irish seem to have entertained very sanguine hopes that James I. would relax the persecuting statutes enacted against them by his predecessor, Elizabeth, but it was soon made apparent to them that they had nothing to expect from him in the way of toleration. He enforced the penal laws made in her reign, and had new ones passed. He established the Court of Wards, of which he was very proud, and he determined to plant the remaining three Provinces as Elizabeth had planted Munster, but more effectively and with more safeguards to secure success. When Elizabeth got hold of an Irish Catholic heir, as happened in the young Earl of Desmond's case, she made him a protestant; but James improved on this system by making a law which constituted the King guardian of all minors. To give effect to this law a Court of Wards was established. The minors were searched for, and taken possession of, and protestant guardians appointed for them, whose chief business it was to teach them contempt and hatred for the religion of their fathers. James planted Ulster with English and Scotch Protestants, and so effectively too, that Catholicity was for a long time supposed to be practically abolished in that Province. Elated with his success in Ulster, he prepared for the Plantation of Leinster and Connaught, and was actually engaged in that work at the time of his death. So that the son of the Catholic Mary Stuart had done more to root the Faith out of Ireland than Elizabeth herself, with her long reign and commanding talents. Two things, however, she must get credit for, she prepared the ground for him, very well, and left him a bright example.

Charles the First's government of Ireland was marked by the great leading faults attributed to the House of Stuart—duplicity, weakness, falsehood, persecution. The fifty-one Graces, or concessions, solemnly promised under his hand, were never granted; the money raised by the people, which was, IN FACT,

* O'Sullivan's Catholic History, p. 133. Dublin Ed. 1850.

the purchase money of those graces, was paid down. Nay more than was promised or asked for, was paid down, but the goods thus purchased were never delivered; the royal word was pledged, but was never redeemed. The King's apologists put forward various excuses for this, but his own letters to Wentworth, some passages of which are cited above, prove conclusively that his real desire was to get the money and then shuffle out of the compact as best he could; and Wentworth, his man of all work in Ireland, proud and arrogant to others, gave him the meanest and most disgraceful aid in doing so; but pride and meanness, like lead and silver are often found in close proximity in the same mine. Wentworth had a motive of his own, too, in having the Graces withheld, for some of them, if granted, would have prevented the carrying out of his favourite scheme for the confiscation of Connaught, on which he entered heart and soul, the first moment he was ready. It has been said of him that he cared little for religion; that he plundered Connaught not to advance protestantism, but to assert the king's prerogative, and to raise money for him. That may be. The motive was, practically, of no importance in the case; Connaught was a Catholic Province, and the effect of confiscating it would be to root the Catholic religion out of it, no matter what the motive or pretence might be. Let each one seek motives or supply them as he may please—the whole tendency of English rule in Ireland, from Henry the 8th to the death of Charles the 1st was to exterminate the Irish race and with them the Catholic Religion.

Before Henry the 8th's time, or rather before Elizabeth's, the making of Ireland a thorough English colony, was deemed sufficient for the success and stability of English rule in Ireland; but by the Protestant Reformation a new element was imported into the system of colonizing and governing this country. Hence, in the Plantation of Munster and Ulster the colonists were not only required to be English, but it was made an essential condition that they should be also members of the new religion. For a long time the Pale was the trusted and only English garrison in Ireland, but when protestantism was introduced, the Palesmen were utterly distrusted, because although English to the hearts' core, they persisted in remaining true to the old Religion. It was naturally believed that the planting of all Ireland with English and Scotch protestants, a system planned, and, as far as lay in her power, carried out by Elizabeth, would secure a complete change of religion in Ireland, as it might be fairly supposed, that it would involve the Irish enemy and Popery in one common ruin. But in places to

which her authority had not as yet fully extended this could not be done at once, so the policy of bringing over and reforming the independent Chiefs was adopted by her as the next best expedient; a system upon which James, as we have seen, improved, by seizing their heirs and educating them as protestants.

CHAPTER IX.

THE WAR OF 1641, AND THE CAUSES WHICH LED TO IT.

ALMOST all the Protestant writers on the war which commenced in 1641, assert that there was peace and toleration for the Catholics of Ireland for many years before it broke out ; but in this assertion they merely copy Temple in the most servile manner. He says :—"The private exercise of all their religious rites and ceremonies was fully enjoyed by them [the Catholics] without any manner of disturbance, and not any of the laws put in execution, whereby heavy penalties were to be inflicted upon transgressors in that kind." And again :—"The two nations had now lived together forty years in peace, with great security and comfort, which had in a manner consolidated them into one body, knit and compacted together with all those bonds and ligatures of friendship, alliance, and consanguinity, as might make up a constant and perpetual union betwixt them."* Having given a glowing description of the perfect happiness in which the Catholics lived for many years before 1641, Clarendon says :—"In this blessed condition of peace and security, the English and the Irish, the protestant and Roman Catholic lived mingled together in all provinces of the kingdom, quietly trafficking with one and another during the whole happy reign of King James."† The chief traffic in Ulster during that happy reign was the robbing of the Catholics of 3,000,000 acres which was bestowed on Scotch and English planters. What a *millennium* for the Catholics of Ulster was not James's reign ! Rabid partizans like Clarendon and *Borlase* might be fairly expected to follow these assertions, and even enlarge upon them, as they have done, but it is strange to find such writers as Carte and Warren repeat them almost word for word.

It was nearly forty years from the death of Elizabeth till the war of 1641 ; hence the assumption is, that during the reign of James I., and the chief part of that of his son Charles, the Catholics practised their religion unmolested. How unfounded this is, may be seen from the account I have already given of

* Temple's History of the Rebellion of 1641, p. 15, 4to Ed.

† Clarendon's Historical Review of the Affairs of Ireland, p. 7. Dub. Ed. 1719.

those two reigns, the principal points of which, I think, may be briefly, and with advantage, repeated here. The fact is, that James enforced the penal statutes against the Irish Catholics with as much if not greater rigour than Elizabeth. In 1605, soon after coming to the throne, he banished the regular clergy from Ireland by Proclamation, and, later on, the secular priests were commanded to quit the kingdom in the same summary manner.* By an additional clause which Chichester wickedly foisted into the King's Proclamation, in order to bring Recusants within the grasp of the Star Chamber, sixteen Catholic Aldermen of the City of Dublin were heavily fined, and kept prisoners in the Castle, for not attending the Lord Mayor to Protestant service. James, however, highly approved of Chichester's action in the matter, and "sends him his very hearty commendations" for his proceedings in "beginning to redress the corruptions of religion."† The king goes on to lament the seduction of the people by seminary priests and Jesuits "and that there is no other means to reclaim them than by a *commanding authority that may draw them to be present at Divine Service*, and to hear God's word for their instruction; and that the commandment cannot take place unless it be published, nor by any way so well published as by proclamation, nor the proclamation be available *unless punishment* be imposed on contemptuous disobedience."‡ The Plantation of Ulster began in 1608, and ended in 1620; that is, this wholesale robbery of an entire province was finished just twenty-one years before the breaking out of the war of 1641. Temple and his copyists may talk of toleration, but the seizure from the Catholics of over 3,000,000 acres of their soil, to hand them over to English and Scotch protestants, with the avowed object of making Ulster protestant, is a strange specimen of toleration.

The protestant bishops were never done complaining of the toleration given to priests and papists in Ireland, and of the non-enforcement of the laws against them. The Bishop of Raphoe

* In the Proclamation of the 4th of July, 1605, the King says:—"Whereas his Majesty was informed, that his subjects of Ireland had been deceived by a false report, *that his Majesty was disposed to allow them liberty of conscience*, and the free choice of a religion, contrary to that which he had always professed himself; by which means it has happened that many of his subjects of that kingdom had firmly resolved to remain constantly in that religion. Wherefore, he declared to all his subjects, that *he would not admit any such liberty of conscience as they were made to expect by that report*." He then enjoins the strict and minute observance of the Act of Uniformity. [The Italics in the above extract are the Author's.]

† *Desiderata Cur. Hib.* Vol. 1, p. 463.

‡ Hill's Plantation of Ulster.

went to the King to complain of religious abuses in Ulster, and of the toleration accorded to Papists. He submitted to his Majesty what he called "Overtures for advancement of the true religion and suppressing of Papistrie within the realm of Ireland;" upon which the King had certain articles drawn up, which he sent to Chichester. The first of those articles is, that "There must be a uniform order set down for suppressing of Papistry and planting of the Church, which must be followed forthwith, and prosecuted by every archbishop and bishop without exception." Again, Article 5 says:—"They [the bishops] should be ordained to take heed to trafficking Papists, Jesuits, Seminary Priests, and vagabond friars, to apprehend them and present them to the King's Deputy."*

The Commissioners whom James sent to Ireland in 1613 were furnished with two sets of instructions; one set had reference to the constitution of the Parliament of that year, the other empowered them to inquire into the general grievances of the country, especially the state of religion. As to religion they deplore very much the way in which it was neglected; they re-

* April 26th, 1611. Calendar of State Papers (Ireland), pp. 31—2. The Bishop of Raphoe here referred to was the same Andrew Knox mentioned at page 67, and a Puritan of a very pronounced type; yet, Puritan though he was, and the enemy of episcopacy, as he was bound to be by his religious principles, he managed to get over his scruples so far as to be bishop of two different sees during his life; for he was bishop of Orkney, in Scotland, before he was translated to Raphoe. His great patron was James Hamilton (the eldest son of Hans Hamilton, of Dunlop, in Scotland), who was raised to the peerage by James I. under the title of Viscount Claneboye. This James Hamilton was sent to Ireland by James, while yet King of Scotland only, "in order," says Lodge (Vol. 3, p. 1.), "to hold a correspondence with the English of that Kingdom, and inform his Majesty from time to time of the state, condition, inclinations, and designs of the Irish in case of Queen Elizabeth's death." When James came to the English throne he did not forget the services of his spy; he loaded him with honours, and with more substantial favours in the form of extensive grants of land. Of course he was a genuine Puritan, and by his power with the King got Knox translated to Raphoe. Knox did not confer orders according to the Book of Common Prayer, but to appear to fulfil the law, and at the same time to quiet the consciences of the candidates who presented themselves, he went through a form, "assisted by the neighbouring brethren," as he admits, which form conferred no orders at all, and was not meant to confer them. A Mr. Livingston, one of those so prepared for missionary work, calls the bishop "Mr. Andrew Knox, Bishop of Raphoe." Mant is very severe on Knox for playing Puritan and bishop at the same time. *History of the Church of Ireland*, Vol. 1. p. 456 *et seq.* Although human weakness got the better of Knox with regard to episcopacy, he remained as valiant and zealous as ever against popery. In 1611 he sent his dean with a letter to Salisbury about "the reformation of the abuses of the Irish Church," asking his lordship "to let him (the bishop) understand either by word or writing his advice touching the same, and his furtherance in such particulars as he will point out, tending to the glory of God, and quieting of that wicked seed of sedition, the Antichrist Romayne." Calendar of State Papers, 1611—1614, p. 25.

port that the people have no respect for it, that the nobility and leading men harbour priests, and that many of the churches were in ruins. "For remedying of these ever-flowing evils we [they] suggest a strict execution of the laws against *Popish priests and schoolmasters*, for enforcing attendance at Church, and establishing sufficient and religious schoolmasters, by the diligent visitations of the bishops for the *weeding out of Popish priests*; and instead of idle and scandalous ministers, to place those that are learned and faithful, and compel them to be resident."*

The Lord Deputyship of Chichester ended in 1616, and from the sketch of his government which I have given elsewhere, no one can doubt his zeal and energy against Catholics. Sir Oliver St. John was appointed his successor, and I am disposed to place him even above Chichester as a priest-hunter and a persecutor for conscience sake. The interval between Chichester's departure and Sir Oliver St. John's arrival was filled up by Thomas Jones, Archbishop of Dublin, and Sir John Denham, as Lords Justices, who were quite as zealous against popery as either Chichester or St. John. They were not long in office when they called the Lord Inchequin before them, charging him with a breach of the King's three Proclamations published against receiving Jesuits, &c. The breach of the Proclamations in this instance was, that "he, Lord Inchequin, entertained in his house one Nicholas Nugent, a Jesuit, that he had heard his masses and wilfully retained him for twenty days, and as the said Lord Inchequin showed no repentance or acknowledgement of his offence, he was censured for contempt, fined £500, and ordered to be committed to his Majesty's Castle."† Later on, in 1621, the King himself writes to the Lord Deputy, recommending to him one Alexander Boyd as "being the discoverer and prosecutor of Anderson, the Jesuit;" for which service he was to receive such a sum of money as the Lord Deputy and Council "shall think he has merited."‡

By a Proclamation bearing date January 21st, 1623, from the Lord Deputy and Council, all bishops, priests, abbots, friars, who set up a foreign authority, and "who have flocked hither in spite of sundry Proclamations, ordering them to leave the Kingdom, now got forty days to depart, which if they do not, they will be arrested and imprisoned, the King having given special directions to that effect."§ This Proclamation was re-published in July, but its action was suspended by the King in 1625 "for

* Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1611—1614, p. 447.

† Calendar of State Papers, pp. 122, 123, 1615—1625.

‡ Ibid, p. 337.

§ Ibid, p. 399.

reasons of state;" the reasons of state being the negotiations about the Spanish marriage. But these having fallen through, a Proclamation was issued that all the laws which had been passed against popish bishops, priests, &c., were to be put in execution.*

There were so many Commissions of inquiry in Ireland during James's reign that it might be justly called a reign of Commissions. One of these, and I believe the last appointed by him, to inquire into that everlasting question, the state of religion in Ireland, made a report on the subject, dated June 20th, 1623, only a year and a half before his death, entitled "Orders for his Majesty received by the Commissioners concerning the state of the Church in Ireland." In this document the Commissioners, among other things say, the Lord Deputy and bishops should "choose good schoolmasters and ushers, such as will take the Oath of Supremacy, teach true religion, and that popish schoolmasters and ushers are to be altogether suppressed: all the recusants to be proceeded against, and that the first *sessions* wherein they are convicted, proclamation is to be made that if they conform not before the next *sessions*, then to stand convicted."†

Thus one cannot glance at James's reign, even in the most cursory manner, without observing the activity with which his representatives, with his full approval, pursued the work of spoliation and persecution during the whole of it, excepting only the brief respite which policy made him grant, when his agents were negotiating the Spanish marriage; whilst we look in vain for those halcyon days of peace, friendship, and toleration described by Temple and his followers.

The time which elapsed between James's death and the war of 1641 was chiefly filled up by the contemptible double-dealing of Charles with the Catholics, and the high-handed insolence of Wentworth. And even if James's reign had been a good and tolerant one, instead of being one of persecution, and if the English in Ireland had been a race of amicable improving emigrants, instead of a domineering race of exterminators, still the mean, miserable mendacity of his son and successor, Charles, and the swaggering insufferable insolence and wholesale robbery of Wentworth are more than sufficient to account for, and to justify the war of 1641.

But to account fully for that war we must take a more extensive view of Irish affairs than that presented by the reign of Elizabeth, James, and Charles; we must, for a little, go back to

* Calendar of State Papers, 1615—1625, p. 459.

† Ibid, pp. 418, 419.

the English invasion itself. At that period both peoples were Catholic, but that did not prevent the growth of those feelings which the invaded always entertain against the invaders. "If the English looked upon themselves as the conquerors of the others, as the more civilized polished people, and superior to them in the arts of life; the Irish looked upon them as their mortal enemies, who had invaded their country without any just cause of hostility; who had plundered them in every way of their effects, deprived them of their estates and liberties, and whom it was reasonable to oppose by skill and force whenever they had an opportunity, that they might be restored to their own possessions."*

The ancient Romans succeeded in reconciling many of their conquered provinces to their yoke, but this was effected by consummate statesmanship and generous treatment. No such means were used to reconcile Ireland to English rule. There was, indeed, clever statesmanship, but it was of a tyrannical and persecuting kind, and lacked not only generosity, but the most ordinary justice and fair play. One race despised and trampled on the other, whilst that other sprang up into armed resistance whenever it had an opportunity, and not unfrequently without an opportunity, or reasonable hope of success. To the English the natives were always the "Irish enemy," and hence there was not, and could not be a real fusion of the two races.† The English Pale represented the English Nation in Ireland, and the attempts to enlarge the Pale, which were almost continuous, were to the Irish mind a new invasion—a new confiscation. The Palesmen, to be sure, sometimes intermarried with the natives, and even made treaties with them to resist the oppressions of the English, which now and then were inflicted even on the people of the Pale, but the Palesman never ceased to be heart and soul an Englishman. The plantation of Ulster, so vast in extent and so effectively done, together with James's known determination to confiscate and plant the whole nation on the same model, must have convinced the Irish of the necessity of making a supreme

* *Warner's History of the Rebellion and Civil War in Ireland*, 2nd Ed. 4to, p. 9.

† The Irish were reputed "Aliens and Enemies" by the English, and were denied the right of bringing actions in any of the English Courts in Ireland for trespasses of their lands, or for assaults or batteries to their persons. It was answer enough to such action that the plaintiff was an Irishman, unless he could produce a special charter giving him the rights of an Englishman. If an Englishman was indicted for manslaughter, and the man slain was an Irishman, he pleaded that the deceased was of the Irish Nation, and it was, therefore, no felony to kill him. For this, however, there was a fine of "five marks to the King or Lord of the manor," "*but mostly they killed us for nothing*," *Cromwellian Settlement*, 2nd Ed. p. 21.

effort for life and land, unless they were craven enough to submit to be annihilated without a struggle.

Next to this feeling, or rather intimately united with it, was the firm resolve to keep their faith at all sacrifices. In fact, fighting for their country and fighting for their religion got blended into one sentiment in the Irish mind, which sentiment is not inaptly expressed by the phrase so trite amongst us:—"For Faith and Fatherland." That attachment to their faith was the chief, if not the sole cause of the war of 1641 cannot for a moment be doubted. Even Dr. Leland, a fellow of Trinity College, more than a hundred years ago acknowledges this. "To the influence of national prejudices and grievances," he writes, "in estranging the people from English government, we are to add the powerful operation of religious principles and prepossessions. Far the greater number of inhabitants were obstinately devoted to popery, provoked and mortified by the penal statutes of Elizabeth, and impatient of the odious disqualifications imposed upon them."* Thus this protestant Doctor of Divinity, in one of the most protestant universities ever founded, admits, although with some reluctance, the attachment of the Irish people to their religion. Warner, the Protestant historian of the war of 1641, substantially expresses the same view, when he says that "an intention to restore the free and unlimited exercise of their religion was one great cause of this rebellion; and to say the truth they had never ceased, from the time of the Reformation, to encroach on the toleration that was allowed them, but by plots, conspiracies and insurrections had been struggling against the Protestant religion, and labouring to overthrow it."† The defence of the Catholic religion is always put prominently forward by the Irish Catholics as the chief cause and justification of the rising of 1641. In the contents of Lord Gormanston's cabinet, captured at Lord Fingal's, in the county of Cavan, 17th April, 1643, we find the speech of Edward Dowdal, of Monkstown, to the gentlemen under arms in Meath, in which he assigns the causes of the war to be—"1st, For a free exercise of Roman Catholic Religion; 2nd, Restoration of H.M.'s. (His Majesty's) Prerogative invaded by the English; 3rd, Independancy of this country, oppressed by the parliament of England."‡ In "the true demands of the Rebels in Ireland, sent into England by Sir Phelim O'Neil, their general," the free exercise of the Catholic Religion is claimed in the first place: "This state" [meaning the Irish Government], says that

* History of Ireland, vol. III., p. 89. 4to Ed.

† History of the Rebellion and Civil War in Ireland, p. 11, 4to Ed.

‡ The Carte MSS. in the Bodleian Library, Oxford." By C. W. Russell, D.D. and J. P. Prendergast, Barrister at Law, Appendix A, p. 195.

document, "assembled for the most part of English, and them of the Irish nation joynd as members thereof with them, being altogether disaffected to our religion, have endeavoured, what in them lay, to take from us our liberties and lawes formerly enacted by Parliament, with the consent of several Princes and Parliaments in England; whereby we have used and exercised our religion according to the due rites and holy and necessary ceremonies thereof,.....which to defend and preserve, being now ready to fall to decay, and bee brought to destruction; we have been forced to betake ourselves to arms, to defend our religion and liberty; and if the same be againe restored, and our religion tolerated, we shall willingly lay down our arms." The conditions are then set forth, the chief of which are, a demand for the free exercise of the Catholic religion and for free Catholic education.* But perhaps the most important declaration made on the subject is contained in the Remonstrance of the Catholics of Ireland delivered to the King's Commissioners at Trim, in 1642. In that weighty document the question of religion gets the first place; it opens with these words:—"Most gracious Sovereign, we, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Catholics of your Highness's kingdom of Ireland, being necessitated to take arms *for the preservation of our religion*, the maintenance of your Majesty's rights and prerogatives, the natural and just defence of our lives and estates, and the liberties of our country," &c.† And the first article of the Remonstrance runs thus:—"Imprimis. The Catholiques of this Kingdom whom no reward could invite, no persecution could inforce to forsake that religion professed by them and their ancestors for thirteen hundred years or thereabouts, are, since the second year of the reigne of Queene Elizabeth, made incapable of places of honour in Church or Commonwealth, their nobles become contemptible, their gentry debarred from learning in Universities or public schools within this Kingdom, their younger brothers put by all manner of employment in their native country, and necessitated (to their great discomfort and impoverishment of the land) to seeke education and fortune abroad, misfortunes made incident to the said Catholiques of Ireland only (their numbers, qualitie, and loyalty considered) of all the nations of Christendome."

* "The true demands of the rebels in Ireland. Declaring the cause of their taking up arms. Sent into England by Sir Phelim O'Neale, their generall; to the Honourable and High Court of Parliament. Ulster, February 10, 1644. *Aphorismical Discovery or Contemporary History of the Affairs of Ireland from 1641 to 1652*, vol. 1, p. 393.

† The Remonstrance of the Catholics of Ireland, delivered to His Majesty's Commissioners at Trim, 17th March, 1642. It is, perhaps, not unworthy of remark, that this Remonstrance was delivered on St. Patrick's day.

The attitude of the Puritans in England and Scotland, especially in Scotland, alarmed the Irish Catholics; for although the Puritans hated monarchy and episcopacy with genuine hatred, they hated popery to fanatical frenzy, and the most alarming accounts reached this country of their intention to make a descent upon our shores and demolish all the Popish idolaters they could lay hands on. This is put forward by the Northern Catholics in the following words:—
 “It was plotted and resolved by the Puritans of England, Scotland, and Ireland, to extinguish quite the Catholic religion, and the professors and maintainers thereof, out of all the kingdoms; and to put all Catholics of this realm to the sword that would not conform themselves to the Protestant religion.”*
 And, Dr. Anderson, in his *Royal Genealogies*, says, “that the native Irish being well informed, as they thought (in 1641), that they now must either turn Protestants or depart the kingdom, or be hanged at their own doors; they betook to arms in their own defence, especially in Ulster, where the six counties had been forfeited.”† The Puritans were bold, enthusiastic fanatics, who believed they could not render a more acceptable honour to God than to take the life of a Popish idolater, especially if he were a priest. It is not therefore surprising that the Catholics were terrified as the Puritans seized every opportunity to threaten and denounce them.‡ They brought the toleration of Papists into every charge made against the King and his ministers; even in their impeachment of Strafford (our old acquaintance, black Tom Wentworth), one of the articles is that he had levied an army of Irish Papists to enslave the kingdom; Strafford being, in point of fact, no friend to the Catholics at all; whom he robbed, as we know, wholesale.

Among the causes, given in the Trim Remonstrance for the rising of 1641, is the activity of the English parliament in prosecuting and punishing the Catholics. This complaint was well founded. The Puritans ruled in the English House of Commons, and whilst, like the Scots, they were never done proclaiming that everything they did was in the cause of re-

*“The heads of the causes which moved the Northern Irish and Catholics of Ireland to take arms. Anno 1641.” *Desiderata Cur. Hib.* Vol. 2, p. 78. *Curry*, Vol. 2, App. p. 371.

†*Royal Genealogies*, p. 786.

‡“When it was proposed to solicit assistance from the Lutheran princes of Germany, and the Catholic kings of France and Spain, the Puritans replied that the Lutherans were heretics, the Catholics idolaters, and to have recourse to either would be to refuse the protection of God, and lean to the broken reed of Aegypt.” *Baillie* (quoted by Lingard), vol. xii. p. 214.

ligious liberty, it is but too evident that they only sought unlimited licence for themselves and their views, and were most intolerant to the other religious bodies, amongst which their greatest aversion, their real *bête noire*, was Popery. At this time the King published a Proclamation against Recusants; a Committee of the House was appointed to examine it, and they reported that it was quite insufficient for its purpose, on which the House ordered the general of the army to dismiss all the officers who were Papists, and further petitioned the King to deprive all Catholic governors of their places; whilst the justices of the peace were ordered to prosecute Recusants with all the rigour of the law, and a bill was brought into the House for disarming all the Papists in the kingdom.*

*The Scotch Puritans were commonly called Covenanters, on account of having signed the two Covenants, namely, the National Covenant, which had reference to Scotland only, and the Solemn League and Covenant, which they entered into with the English Parliament to strengthen themselves, and with the hope of abolishing Episcopacy in England as well as in Scotland. The earlier of the two was the National Covenant, which bound all who subscribed it, "to spare nothing which might save their religion." In the Solemn League and Covenant the subscribers say, "we shall in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavour the extirpation of popery, prelacy, superstition, heresy, &c."

Having broken away from all authority themselves, it is curious to observe what power and authority they at once laid claim to, amounting, it would seem, to that infallibility which they so fiercely denounced as a Catholic dogma. I here give two or three illustrations:—"Kings," they say, "no less than the rest, must obey and yield to the authority of the ecclesiastical magistrate." *Ecclesiastical Discipline*, p. 142. And the well known Cartwright says, "that Princes must remember to subject themselves to the church, and to submit their sceptres and throw down their crowns before the church; yea, to lick the dust off the feet of the church." *T. Cartwright*, p. 645. Buchanan held that ministers "may excommunicate princes, and they being by excommunication cast into hell are not worthy to enjoy any life upon earth." *De Jure regis apud Scotos*, p. 70.

The devotions of the Puritans were of a most wonderful kind. "Their prayers and sermons," says Hume, "were no other than rhapsodies of unintelligible jargon, which was wonderfully adapted to the ignorant fanaticism that then prevailed in all parts of the nation." *History of England*, Vol. 7, p. 179. 8vo. Ed. 1759.

The most illiterate people were the most favourite preachers among them. "All learning was then cried down," says Dr. R. South, "so that with them the best preachers were such as could not read, and the best divines such as could not write." *Sermons*, Vol. 3, p. 500. Their familiar manner with regard to the Almighty was often very revolting. "Gather upon God," said Mr. R. Harris, "and hold him to it as Jacob did; pressing him with his precepts, with his promises, with his hand, with his seal, with his oath," &c. *Fast Sermon before the Commons*, May 25, 1642, p. 18. When they got inspired they preached so long that they tired everybody. The sexton of one of their churches once said to a long-winded preacher, "Pray, sir, be pleased when you have done to leave the key under the door," and so he departed. After this hint the minister soon wound up.

But if the threats of the Puritans alarmed the Irish Catholics, the success of the same Puritans against the King gave them encouragement, and it has been asserted, with a good show of truth, that the Catholics were quickened into action by the example set them by the Scots, and the favourable terms which the King was constrained to grant them. He, aided by Laud, did his best to force Episcopalianism upon Scotland; but the moment the liturgy which was prepared by English bishops for the Scotch Church was published, the opposition to it became intense and universal, and the pulpits rang with denunciations of the men who sought "to gag the Spirit of God, and to depose Christ from his throne, by betraying to the civil magistrates the authority of the Kirk." When the bishop and dean of Edinburgh appeared in the High Church to hold a Protestant Episcopalian Service, they were assailed with hisses and groans and the most offensive epithets, chiefly by women, the men prudently keeping in the back ground. Stools and big clasped bibles were flung at their heads, and the service could be proceeded with only under the protection of the magistrates. The country was stirred to its centre, and the sermons and extempore prayers of the ministers became more excited and enthusiastic. The National Covenant was prepared, and in a solemn service in the church of the Grey Friars, the vast congregation which crowded it, after a speech from Lord Loudon, rose *en masse*, and with arms outstretched to heaven swore to its contents. Charles was alarmed, and proceeded to offer considerable concessions, but he was late, and so he and his Scotch subjects prepared to settle their differences on the battle field. The Scots raised an army in the beginning of 1639, and Leslie was called home to become their

The claim of the Puritans to personal inspiration and prophecy is well known. A certain Mr. George Swathe, a minister in Suffolk, thus prophesied when the King and Parliament were at war:—"O my good Lord God, I praise Thee for discovering, the last week, in the day time, a vision that there were two great armies about York, one of the malignant party about the king; the other party, parliament and professors, and the better side should have help from heaven. . . . I praise Thee for discovering this victory, at the instant of time it was done, to my wife," &c. Dr. South is responsible for relating the following piece of blasphemy: A noted independent divine, he says, declared, when Oliver Cromwell was sick, that "God revealed to him that he should recover and live thirty years longer; for, that God had raised him up for a work which could not be done in a less time; but Oliver's death being published two days after, the said divine, publicly in his prayers expostulated with God regarding the defeat of his prophecy, in these words:—*Thou hast lied unto us, yea, thou hast lied unto us.*" *Sermons*, Vol. 1. Sermon 3. p. 102. But in Oxford Ed. of 1823, Vol. 1, p. 64, this blasphemy is given by other authorities, although not in precisely the same words.

general. He, at the head of a thousand musketeers, commenced the campaign by surprising and taking the Castle of Edinburgh. There was a temporary peace made by the King with the Scots, but the warlike preparations were proceeded with on both sides. Charles raised an army of twenty thousand men, and Leslie called for every fourth man in Scotland, whilst the ministers who were in his camp sent written exhortations throughout the country. One of these called on every true Scot, in the name of God, to hasten to the aid of his countrymen, to extort a reasonable peace from the King, or "to seek in battle their common enemies, the prelates and papists of England." Another denounced the curse of Meroz against all who refused to come to the help of the Lord; and a third, in "bitter and sarcastic language, summoned the loiterers to attend the burial of the saints, whom they had abandoned to the swords of the idolaters."*

Ultimately the Scots had the best of it, and having crossed the Tyne, they became masters of the two northern counties of England, Durham and Northumberland. Of course they required supplies. The saints were scrupulous at first, and deemed it unlawful to plunder any but the idolatrous papists; those scruples were soon overcome, and they not only confiscated all the property of the Catholics, with the tithes and rents of the clergy, but they seized coal and forage at discretion, and levied a weekly contribution of £5,600 off the two counties. These supplies, after a time began to fail, and they boldly demanded a subsidy of £40,000 a month from the King's commissioners, as long as they abstained from acts of hostility; but they consented to come down to the old £5,600 a week, provided it was guaranteed to them, which was accordingly done. After the humiliation of seeing two of his English counties occupied by the Scots, and after being worsted in the field, and fearing to risk the fortune of war any further, Charles had to condescend to accredit Commissioners to treat with the Covenanters at Ripon.

In imitating the Scots, if they did imitate them, the Irish seem not to have correctly realised their position, for the Scots had a vast body of co-religionists in England, and the Commons of England at their back; whilst the Irish Catholics, who could hope for nothing from the King, had to contend with a puritan parliament in England, and a powerful puritan faction at home, who held in their hands the whole government of the country.

* See Lingard, vol. VII. p. 216.

CHAPTER X.

THE WAR OF '41 CONTINUED.

It does not appear that the rising of 1641 was preceded by any very long or elaborate preparations; but there can be no doubt that the Irish Catholics at home and abroad cherished the hope of, one time or another, shaking off the tyranny which robbed them of their lands, and for a long period had, with consummate skill, been labouring to uproot their religion. They were awaiting their opportunity, and, in some sense, resembled a heap of dry fuel which only requires a spark to make it burst into a conflagration. Numbers of Irish and the descendants of Irish—the very best blood of the Milesian race—eked out a precarious existence as landless, homeless wanderers abroad, whilst those at home had, year after year, to endure new confiscations, and bear newly-forged chains, for conscience sake. The laws did not permit the Irish Catholics to be educated at home, unless they consented to be brought up as protestants; whilst under severe penalties, they were forbidden to go abroad for education, lest they should be trained and strengthened in the faith of their ancestors. Still some managed to reach seminaries on the Continent, in which it not unfrequently happened that there were Irish priests as professors, and the descendants of Irish exiles as students. Although, like the Israelites when in exile, they were not in the humour to sing the songs of their land, they were in the right temper to discuss its wrongs, weep over its afflictions, and concoct plans for redeeming it from bondage.* Amongst the Irish youths who succeeded in going abroad for education was Roger O'Moore, the lineal descendant of the Chiefs of Leix. In Spain he met the son of Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone, who had obtained the colonelcy of a regiment in that country. It cannot for a moment be doubted that two such men would enter earnestly into the affairs of Ireland, and weigh the prospects of

* "Upon the rivers of Babylon, there we sat and wept, when we remembered Sion: on the willows in the midst thereof we hung up our instruments. For they that led us into captivity required of us the words of songs. And they that carried us away said: Sing ye to us a hymn of the songs of Sion. How shall we sing the song of the Lord in a strange land? If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand be forgotten." *Ps. cxxxvi. vv. 1, et seq.*

being able to strike a blow for her ; an opinion which is strengthened by the fact that, as far as is known, Roger O'Moore, on his return, was the first who began to sound the dispositions of leading Catholics as to the feasibility of rising up in armed force to assert their rights. It may be fairly assumed, too, that the heir of the great House of O'Neill undertook on his side to obtain as much support as he could from the Spanish government.

O'Moore possessed all the qualities necessary to bend others to his views. He was the accepted representative of a great House, which was always true to Ireland ; he was a man of fine presence, and noble bearing, yet amiable and condescending ; he was highly educated, and above all, he was enthusiastic in the cause he had taken in hand. He, by degrees, found friends whom he could trust, and who trusted him. One of the first, if not the very first, of these was his kinsman Richard Plunket, son of that Sir Richard Plunket, who was a distinguished leader of the opposition in Parliament during Chichester's government. Lord Maguire, Baron of Inniskillin, soon came into his views. Hugh Oge M'Mahon, Philip O'Reilly, and Torlogh O'Neill, brother of Sir Phelim, were sounded by O'Moore, and won over to the project. Later on, Sir Phelim O'Neill himself joined O'Moore ; and as Sir Phelim was then the most considerable man of his name in Ulster, his acquisition was considered very important by O'Moore and his party.

The first meeting on the subject of the Rising appears to have taken place in the winter or spring of 1640. Lord Maguire in his "Relation," says that being in Dublin in Candlemas Term, 1640, Roger O'Moore wrote to him asking him for an interview, which, after some unavoidable delays, he gave him. O'Moore opened the business to him and got his consent to take part in it. Next day, Philip O'Reilly and Lord Maguire dined with O'Moore at his lodgings, and after dinner Torlogh O'Neill and Hugh M'Mahon joined them. These five constituted, as far as Lord Maguire knew, the first meeting on the subject. To the four gentlemen named above O'Moore developed his hopes and plans, which went to show, that assistance could be had from abroad ; that the Palesmen would be either neutral or give them assistance ; that the danger to the Catholics from the Puritans was imminent and alarming ; and that considering the King's differences and difficulties with the Puritans, the time was opportune for the Catholics to rise in defence of their religion and their liberties. He alleged as a justification for this, the wholesale robberies inflicted upon them by repeated confiscations, and the present urgent necessity of defending their religion.

The main reliance for assistance from abroad rested on Colonel Don John O'Neill, as the Spaniards called him. He was acknowledged on the Continent as Earl of Tyrone, and had great influence with Philip the IV. of Spain, and no less at the Court of Rome. He was advanced to the dignity of Major General by Philip.

Not long after O'Moore had opened the business to Lord Maguire, there landed in Ireland one Neill O'Neill, who had been sent from Spain by the Earl of Tyrone "to speak with the gentry of his name and kindred, to let them know that he had treated with Cardinal Richelieu for obtaining succour to come for Ireland, and that he prevailed with the Cardinal, so that he was to have arms, ammunition, and money from him on demand to come for Ireland, and that he only expected [awaited] a convenient time to come away; and to desire them to be in readiness, and to procure all others whom they could to be so likewise."* But Don John O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone, was not spared to come to Ireland or to strike a blow for her, for he fell in action fighting for his Catholic Majesty against his rebellious subjects in Cataluna.† The first report of the Earl's death which reached Ireland was not believed. The messenger who had come from him was sent back with certain information as to the intentions and arrangements of O'Moore and the rest, but as the reported death of the Earl had reached Ireland before his departure, he was ordered, should it prove true, not to go back to Spain, but to go into the Low Countries to Colonel Owen O'Neill, and to acquaint him with the Earl's commission. "But presently after his departure, the certainty of the Earl's death was known, and on further resolution it was agreed that an express messenger should be sent to the Colonel, to make all the resolutions known to him, and to return speedily with an answer.

* "The Relation of the Lord Maguire, written with his own hand in the Tower, and delivered by him to Sir John Conyers, then Lieutenant, to present to the Lords in Parliament." *Borlase*, p. 31. *Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland, 1641-1652*, Vol. I., p. 501 *et seq.* The "Relation" of the Lord Maguire has a good deal of internal evidence in favour of its veracity, and many of its statements are supported by other and independent testimony; but "in estimating the value of the . . . depositions purporting to have been made by persons in duress, it is to be remembered that we have respectable contemporary attestations, addressed to Charles I., that in 1641-2, prisoners in Ireland were examined under the Governmental authority—some by menace, others by torture, and most were necessitated to subscribe to what the examiners pleased to insert." *Preface to History of Affairs in Ireland, &c.*, Vol. 1, p. xvi. By John T. Gilbert, F.S.A., M.R.I.A.

† Tyrconnell was also killed in this campaign. Tyrone left one child, a son named Hugh, aged 9 years. *History of Affairs, &c.*, Vol. 1, p. 6.

And so one Toole O'Cornely, a priest (as I think, parish priest to O'Moore) was sent away to Colonel O'Neill."*

O'Moore was very pressing that the Rising should not be delayed; yet he wished it postponed until the approach of winter, as in winter neither soldiers nor supplies could be sent from England, and the Irish would thus have till the following May to strengthen and consolidate their position. At first the 5th of October was fixed upon for the Rising, but the chiefs soon found they could not be prepared for that day. They met, however, on the 5th, and finally fixed on the 23rd of the same month for their great and perilous effort. It was further settled that the Rising should be as general and as simultaneous as possible throughout Ireland. Dublin Castle was to be the first object of attack, by a chosen body of two hundred men well officered. The resolution to surprise the Castle was taken late in the business, nor would the non-military gentlemen have thought of such an attempt, but that the Colonels (i.e. O'Byrne, Sir J. Dillon, and Plunket) proposed it for the double purpose of obtaining arms and of over-awing the citizens with the artillery which they knew was kept there, until succour could arrive from other places.

The Castle was to be surprised by a joint force of Leinster and Ulster men. O'Moore offered himself freely to be one of the leaders of the Leinster contingent, undertaking that Colonel O'Byrne would be another. He also promised to procure as many Leinster gentlemen as he could for the enterprise. He suggested that either Lord Maguire or Sir Phelim O'Neill should be chief leader of the Ulster men on the occasion. Sir Phelim excused himself on the ground that Londonderry should be taken, and that it would not be taken unless he was present. Lord Maguire was therefore appointed for the attack on the Castle. Colonels Dillon and Plunket asked also to be excused from accompanying Lord Maguire, as their friends of the Pale were not willing to join O'Moore and his associates in their first attempts. These defections did not damp O'Moore's ardour or determination, and the preparations still went forward. As in all such enterprises not only defections, but unforeseen difficulties and disappointments occurred. Some of the gentlemen who had promised a certain number of men for the attack failed to send them—notably Sir Phelim O'Neill and Colonel McMahon,—so that instead of the two hundred agreed upon as necessary, it was found on the eve of the attack that O'Moore had only eighty men for the undertaking. Yet he wavered not.

* Lord Maguire's "Relation.

What is wonderful in all this is the secrecy with which those who planned the Rising were able to carry on for such a length of time such extensive preparations; at the critical moment, however, a traitor was found in their camp, in the person of Owen O'Connolly. This O'Connolly comes before us in a very nondescript character. In his "Relation", he calls Hugh Oge M'Mahon "his neere kinsman and intimate friend;" and he says M'Mahon wrote to him as "cousin Owen." He is also set down as a servant to Sir John Clotworthy, one of the Ulster planters, and Colonel of a regiment that bore his name. O'Connolly is called Sir John's Sergeant-Major by the English House of Commons in 1645, and again Major O'Connolly simply. It is probable that his father was a victim of the Confiscation of Ulster, and that Clotworthy took Owen into his house, while yet young; a view which is strengthened by the fact, that he was brought up a protestant. But all these points taken into consideration we look in vain for a sufficient motive on the part of M'Mahon for sending for him, and entrusting him with the plans agreed upon by the Chiefs of the Rising.

If however we accept the account of O'Connolly, given by "A British Officer in the Regiment of Sir John Clotworthy," as correct, which there seems to be no reason to doubt, it explains the connection between M'Mahon and O'Connolly. "As for M'Mahon," writes the British Officer, "I cannot apprehend that his relation or obligation on Connolly as being his Father's foster son, alias Foster-Brother, was sufficient grounds for him to acquaint so mean a Man with so great a secrecy, being of a contrary opinion and Religion, or did appear by him in discharging his conscience as became a true Protestant."* M'Mahon came to Dublin on the eve of the Rising, whither O'Connolly followed him, not having found him at his house in Monaghan, where it was originally arranged by M'Mahon they should meet and have an interview.

* *The History of the War of Ireland from 1641 to 1653. By a British Officer of the regiment of Sir John Clotworthy, p. 5.* "A British Officer" could not be expected to understand the sacred relations which were engendered in Ireland by fosterage; but they were such that the fact of O'Connolly being foster-brother to M'Mahon (assuming that it was so) is more than sufficient to explain why he was entrusted with the great secret of the Irish rising. At present it seems almost incredible the affection which formerly existed between foster-brothers in this country. The son of the foster-father was almost always near his foster-brother in battle, and he felt it a point of duty to defend him with his life, or to die in his stead if necessary. Previous to this case of O'Connolly, I do not remember to have met one in which fosterage proved untrue; except that most flagitious one, the betrayal of the Great Earl of Desmond by his foster-brother Moriarty. The foster-brother of one of the Earls of Kildare was killed beside him in a battle in Ulster, which fact caused the Earl to die of grief within a year.

According to O'Connolly's "Relation" he and M'Mahon, with others, indulged in some potations of beer and sack, the effects of which were so evident on O'Connolly when he went to Lord Justice Parsons, on the night of the 22nd October, to discover the plot, that Parsons paid but little heed to his revelations; yet thought them of sufficient importance to be communicated to his fellow Lord Justice Borlase. Parsons had sent O'Connolly back to M'Mahon to seek, as he said, further information, but really, it would appear, to get rid of him as a drunken impostor. Borlase took the matter much more seriously than Parsons; sent at once in search of O'Connolly, and found him in the hands of the night watchmen. He was brought back and put to bed for some time to clear his intellect, and enable him to make a more coherent statement.*

The Lords-Justices and Council showed but little energy or decision on the discovery of the plot, for which they are much blamed by historians; but I believe that whatever inertness they showed arose, in a great measure, from their not being able to give at once full credence to such a miserable informer as O'Connolly. Of all the men who travelled to Dublin to assist at the rising, the Government only succeeded in arresting about thirty, and those chiefly servants and other unimportant people. But two leaders were secured, Lord Maguire and Hugh Oge

* The unknown author of the "Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland, 1641—1652," who was a devoted partizan of the Rising of 1641, says:—"Alas, unconstant fortune, grudging, as it weare, at so greate happiness of both Kinge and Irish nation; a drunken sott that beared my Lord of Inniskillin [Maguire] companie, discovered the plott." Vol. 1., p. 12. O'Connolly was well rewarded for his information. Here is the order of the English House of Commons on the subject:—"1. Die Lunæ, primo, Novembris, 1641. Resolved, upon the question that Owen Connelles, who discovered this great Treason in Ireland, shall have five hundred pounds presently paid him, and two hundred pounds per annum pension, until provision be made of inheritance of a greater value; and to be recommended to the Lord Lieutenant-General of Ireland for some preferment there." *Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland, 1641—1652, Vol. 1., p. 355.*

O'Connolly's death was miserable enough. He returned to Ireland with Cromwell in 1649, as Colonel O'Connolly, and obtained from Colonel Venables, then in Belfast, two troops of horse to attack a certain Colonel Hamilton, who, with a small party of horse, traversed the country, alarming and giving much annoyance to the Parliamentarians. O'Connolly and his forces met and attacked Hamilton near a place called Leel. O'Connolly led his men up a narrow lane, where, having got entangled, Hamilton fell upon them and utterly routed them, killing many. O'Connolly was taken prisoner, but being permitted to ride on his own fleet mare, he attempted to escape from those who guarded him. One of the guard named Hamilton (not the leader) unhorsed him, and killed him with a kick when on the ground. "His body was carried like a sack on a horse to ——— that night, and next day was sent for and interred at Antrim. The man was as stoute as could be desired, but of no more conduct than a man hot ire'd." *History of the Warr of Ireland from 1641 to 1653, by a British Officer of the Regiment of Sir John Clotworthy, pp. 93—4.*

M'Mahon ; O'Moore, Plunket, O'Byrne, and other chiefs having made their escape. Although the intended attack on the Castle of Dublin came to nothing, the Irish leaders had great success in the provinces, especially in Ulster, still smarting under the wholesale robbery of James ; "so that within the space of eight days," says Leland, "the rebels were absolute masters of the entire counties of Tyrone, Monaghan, Longford, Leitrim, Fermanagh, Cavan, Donegal, and Derry (except the places already mentioned and some inferior castles) together with some parts of the counties of Armagh and Down."*

And thus began the Great Civil War of 1641, which desolated the country for so many years, and left such sorrowful reminiscences behind it.

* *History of Ireland, Vol. 3.*, pp. 117—118. The places above excepted by Leland were :—Derry, Coleraine, Lisnagarvey or Lisburn, Carrickfergus, and Enniskillen ; which places, he says, "were maintained against the boisterous assaults of the rebels." *Ibid.*

CHAPTER XI.

THE EARLIER EVENTS OF THE CIVIL WAR.

ONE of the greatest scourges that can befall a country is civil war. Some indeed are of opinion that a religious war is as bad or worse, and perhaps it is equally as dreadful. Unfortunately the Rising of 1641 was a combination of both. In the account which my plan compels me to give of this rising and its progress, my readers must be prepared for scenes of blood and misery, and sometimes for the unprovoked slaughter of unoffending people. When neighbours fall out they commonly become the bitterest enemies. Besides, in most civil wars each party persists in regarding the other as rebels, and not, therefore, entitled to the protection which regular warfare affords. The histories which detail the events of the Civil War of 1641 are deeply coloured with the party feelings of the authors. Written from a partizan standpoint, they represent their own side to the greatest advantage, and are always severe on, and not unfrequently very unjust to, the other. The first event I have to deal with illustrates this in a striking manner; and that is the grievous slaughter that was perpetrated on Island Magee, which place is not really an island, but a peninsula in the County Antrim, lying between Carrickfergus and Larne. It consists of something over 7,000 statute acres, and in 1641 seems to have been exclusively inhabited by Catholic Irish. It is separated from a portion of the mainland by an arm of the sea called Larne Lough, but is united to it towards Carrickfergus, from which it can be entered without difficulty.

The fact of a number of innocent unoffending people, in no wise connected with the Rising, having been inhumanly butchered on Island Magee, is not denied by any historian of the period, but on two points an important difference of opinion has arisen—1. as to the date of the massacre; 2. as to the number of persons slain.

1. The date of the massacre on Island Magee derives its importance from the fact, that the writers on the Catholic side assert it was the first actual Massacre on either side after the Rising, whilst some Protestant historians place it in January, 1642, with the object of showing that it was committed in revenge for

the lives taken by order of Sir Phelim O'Neill. As to the date of the Massacre, the earlier historians of the Rising are anything but satisfactory. They do not really deal with the date of it, but endeavour to reduce, as far as they can, the number of the slain. Replying to some one who wrote under the initials R. S., Borlase says: "Indeed, his whole piece is such a web, as unravelled, would be found to be mere fictions and imposture, after what is accounted for breach of protection, forfeiture of articles, treachery and the like. That which he writes of the Scotch forces in Knockfergus, [Carrickfergus] murdering, if you will believe him, in the Isle of MacGee, 3,000 innocent persons, in the beginning of November, to be the first massacre in Ireland on either side, (it seems he heard nothing then of O'Hara's daughter), is so false, as he that will read John Carmick's testimony at the tryal of Hugh Oge MacMahon, the 18th of November, 1644, attested by Sir William Cole, Sir William Hamilton, Sir Arthur Loftess, Sir Charles Coote, and others, upon oath, besides what the Clergy's remonstrance clears, will plainly perceive the vanity and falseness of that assertion, as amongst others, appears by John Cardiff, Rector of the parish of Disert-eragh in Tyrone, a person of known integrity, who deposeth, that the very first day Mr. Mader, minister of the parish of Donnoghmore, was murdered by the Donnelies; within a while after, Mr. New, curate to Mr. Bradley, of the church of Ardara, as Mr. Blyth, with eight more; not to say anything of Rowry MacQuire's dealing with Mr. Middleton, the 24th of October, at Castle-Skeagh, alias Ballibalfure, where, after he had by treachery got into the castle, seized on his money, burnt the public records and compelled him to acknowledge the Mass, he caused him, his wife and children to be hanged, besides a hundred to be murdered at least, in that town; and thence daily proceeded in such outrages."*

* Borlase, Folio Ed., p. 77. Dublin, 1743. All taken verbatim from Temple. *obs.* Carmick's estimate of the number of protestants killed in Ulster during the first four months of the Rising is so utterly absurd and incredible that I almost hesitate to give it—it is 150,000 persons!!! Other things in his sworn informations are substantially true, as we know from independent sources. The following extract is a striking commentary on Carmick's reckless assertion with regard to the number slain, and also upon the exaggerations of Temple, Borlase, &c. "As to the number of British murdered the first winter of the wars, I will acquaint the reader with the same, as far as I could learn, after scrutiny made into the same, as I said before. The most was committed in Ulster, and it did not exceed through all Ulster above the SIXTIETH PART held forth by those authors I have named before; yet I believe this will be incredulous to some; but if they please to inquire after it, and learn the truth, they will see that I exceed not far the truth, as far as possibly could be inquired into." *The History of the Warr of Ireland from 1641 to 1653, by a British Officer of the*

In the two paragraphs which Warner devotes to Island Magee his chief objects are, (1) to minimize the number of people inhabiting that peninsula as far as possible, and (2) to confound the words "murder" and "massacre" so as to make them mean substantially the same thing. He says, "several murders were committed in the three first days of the insurrection;" which is probably true enough, for such things happen in every insurrection; some being slain because they resist the insurgents, others not unfrequently without any sufficient cause, or through private malice. The conduct of Rory Maguire at Lisnaskeagh Castle is repeated by Borlase and Warner on the authority of Temple, who quotes it from a relation sent to him (Temple) by Sir John Dunbar. Now, Temple, as everybody knows, is a most untrustworthy writer, and, strange to say, he does not give the "Relation" in full, but merely says it was sent to him. I find no other authority on either side which makes any reference to this important event at Lisnaskeagh.†

"It will naturally be expected that something be here said of the number of persons that were either killed in these massacres, or perished in their flight by the fatigue and hardships of the journey, or by the inclemency of the weather. The task is not to be declined, though it certainly is a very tender point for a man to speak his sentiments in an affair of so much horror, if he chances to differ from those who have thought they could never exaggerate it enough, though they have done it to such a degree, as is utterly incredible, without supposing, at the same time, that the whole Irish Nation to a man, had cast off at once all sense of humanity; and the rather, because there is no fixing a number with any exactness and certainty, but all must be left to conjecture, which leaves every man at liberty as well to imagine for himself as to censure others whose sentiments differ from his own. It is however easy enough to show the falsehood of those accounts, which make the number amount, some to three hundred thousand, some to two hundred thousand, and

Regiment of Sir John Clotworthy, pp. 9-10. Dublin 1873. Some wag put those exaggerations in a humorous light when he said that, "All the protestants in Ireland woke up one morning and found their throats cut."

† Sir John Dunbar belonged to an old respectable, but needy family in Wigtownshire. He came to Ireland as an undertaker in 1615, and obtained considerable lands in Fermanagh. Hill's *Plantation of Ulster*, p. 306. The following passage relating to Rory Maguire is found at p. xxii. of Mr. Gilbert's introduction to the *History of Affairs in Ireland*, 1641-52:—"After Lord Maguire's arrest, his brother Rory, a nephew of Owen O'Neill, became leader of the Irish in Fermanagh, 'the best planted of the northern counties.' He endeavoured vainly to induce Colonel Audley Mervyn, already mentioned, whose sister he had married, to intervene with the government authorities to induce them to adopt conciliatory measures towards the natives in arms."

others again, affecting an air of exactness to one hundred and fifty four thousand ; numbers greater (I am persuaded upon reading the examinations in two or three large volumes in folio, taken by the Commissioners appointed to enquire into that affair) than all the depositions as to particular facts (twenty or thirty whereof often relate to the same) taken together, and as relating to so many several facts, and without any distinction of the nature of the evidence, whether upon hearsay, report, (which in such cases always magnify) or otherwise, would justly warrant any body to suppose, and more indeed than there were of English at that time in Ireland. Sir William Petty computes the British (including those in both English and Scots) to be before the rebellion in proportion to the Irish, as two to eleven ; at which rate there were about two hundred and twenty thousand British in the whole kingdom. Now it is certain, that the great body of the English was settled in Munster and Leinster, where very few murders were committed ; and that in Ulster, which was the dismal scene of the massacre, there were above one hundred thousand Scots, who before the general plantation of it, had settled in great numbers in the counties of Downe and Antrim, and new shoals of them had come upon the plantation of the six escheated counties ; and they were so very powerful therein that the Irish, either out of fear of their numbers, or for some other politick reason, spared those of that nation, (making proclamation on pain of death, that no Scotsman should be molested in body, goods, or lands), whilst they raged with so much cruelty against the English. There were none of this latter nation settled in Ulster before the Plantation ; there were (as I see by Lord Chichester's book) but fifty English undertakers concerned in carrying on that work ; and it was not so easy for these to bring from England, a rich, plentiful, and quiet country, any considerable number of husbandmen and artificers, to a strange country, wasted and inhabited by a wild, savage, turbulent and rapacious people, whose language they knew not, as it was for the Scots undertakers to bring numbers from Scotland, where near half the nation spake the Irish tongue, and whence they were to remove to a country naturally more fertile than their own, and wherein they had multitudes of friends, relations, and countrymen to assist, and instruct them in those methods of improving land and enriching themselves, which they had practised before them with success. It cannot, therefore, reasonably be presumed, that there were at most above twenty thousand English souls of all ages and sexes in Ulster at this time ; and of these (as appears by the Lords Justices' letters) there were several thousand got safe to Dublin, and were sub-

sisted there for many months afterwards.* Besides six thousand women and children, which Captain Mervyn saved in Fermanagh, and others that got safe to Derry, Coleraine, Carrickfergus, and went from those and other parts into England. These considerations, if not sufficient to reduce the number to P. Walsh's computation, made (as he alleges) after a regular and exact enquiry, and amounting to about eight thousand in all, do yet incline me to think it could not exceed that of Sir W. Petty, who had an head excellently turned for calculations, and had been, soon after the war, in every part of the kingdom, and surveyed the whole of it, and had therefore sufficient opportunities of information, and was neither by interest nor inclination disposed to favour the Irish; and yet he thinks that there were only thirty-seven thousand British massacred in all the first year of the troubles; and that those who think there were greater numbers destroyed, ought to review the grounds of their opinion."†

Again, Carte says:—"The chief force of the Rebels was now employed in the neighbouring County of Downe. On the 15th of this month [Nov. 1641], they, after a fortnight's siege, reduced the Castle of Loargan [Lurgan]; Sir William Bromley [Brownlow], after a stout defence, surrendering upon terms of marching out with his family and goods: but such was the unworthy disposition of the Rebels, that they kept him, his lady and children prisoners, rifled his house, plundered, stripped and killed most of his servants, and treated all the towns-people in the same manner. This was the first breach of faith which the Rebels were guilty of (at least in these parts), in regard of

* See Lords Justices' letters of March 4, 1641-2, &c., and journal of the Lords in England, 14 Dec. 1641. Nalson, Vol II., p. 737-738.

† Carte's *Ormonde*, vol. 1, pp. 177-178. Petty's *Historical View of the Affairs of Ireland*, p. 16. I give the full passage from Sir William Petty:—"Whereas the present proportion of the British is as 3 to 11, but before the Wars the proportion was less, viz.: as 2 to 11; and then it follows that the number of British slain in 11 years was 112,000 souls; of which I guess two-thirds to have perished by war, plague and famine. So as it follows that 37,000 were massacred in the first years of tumults; so as those who think 150,000 were so destroyed, ought to review the grounds of their opinion." *The Political Anatomy of Ireland*, pp. 18 and 19.

Sir William Petty computes, as above, that 112,000 British were slain in the eleven years of the war, viz.: from 1641 to 1652, but I have found no author except Petty who thought it of sufficient importance to quote the number of native Irish slain within the same eleven years. I give it from him, an English official, and, as Carte says above, no friend to the Irish:—"It follows also," Petty says, "that about 504,000 of the Irish perished, and were wasted by the sword, plague, famine, hardship, and banishment, between the 23rd October, 1641, and the same day, 1652." *Political Anatomy of Ireland*, p. 19.

articles of capitulation; for when Mr. Conway, on Nov. 5, surrendered his castle of Bally Aghie, in the County of Downe, to them, they kept the terms for which he stipulated, and allowed him to march out with his men, and to carry away trunks with plate and money in them to Antrim. Whether the slaughter made by a party from Carrickfergus, in the territory of Magee [Island Magee], a long narrow island running from that town up to Olderfleet (in which it is affirmed that near 3,000 harmless Irishmen, women, and children were cruelly massacred) happened before the surrender of Loargan, is hard to be determined, the relations published of facts in those times being very indistinct and uncertain, with regard to the time when they were committed, though it is confidently asserted, that the said massacre happened in this month of November.”*

The author who asserts most confidently that the slaughter on Island Magee occurred in the beginning of January, 1642, and not in November, as asserted by the Catholic historians, is Leland. I give his words:—“An enthusiastic hatred of the Irish was the natural and necessary consequence [of the cruelties of the Irish at Portadown and other places.]† The British settlers, who were sheltered in places of security, forgot that their suffering brethren had, in several instances, been rescued from destruction and protected by the old natives. Their abhorrence was violent and indiscriminate: and it transported them to that very brutal cruelty which had provoked this abhorrence. The Scottish soldiers, in particular, who had reinforced the garrison of Carrickfergus, were possessed with an habitual hatred of popery, and inflamed to an implacable detestation of the Irish by multiplied accounts of their cruelties, horrible in themselves, and exaggerated, not only by the sufferers, but by those who boasted and magnified their barbarities. In one fatal night they issued from Carrickfergus into an adjacent district, called Island Magee, where a number of the poorer Irish resided, unoffending, and untainted by the rebellion. If we may believe one of the leaders of the party, thirty families were assailed by them in their beds, and massacred with calm and deliberate cruelty. As if the incident were not sufficiently hideous, popish writers have represented it with shocking aggravation. They make the number of the slaughtered, in a small and thinly inhabited neck of land, to

* Carte's Ormonde. vol. I., p. 188.

† The circumstances and extent of these cruelties will be dealt with later on.

amount to three thousand; a wildness and absurdity into which other writers of such transactions have been betrayed. They assert that this butchery was committed in the beginning of November; that it was the first massacre committed in Ulster, and the great provocation to all the outrages of the Irish in this quarter. Mr. Carte seems to favour this assertion.* Had he carefully perused the collection of original depositions now in possession of the University of Dublin, he would have found his doubts of facts and dates cleared most satisfactorily; and that the massacre of Island Magee (as appears from several unsuspicious evidences) was really committed in the beginning of January, when the followers of O'Neill had almost exhausted their barbarous malice."†

In "The History of the Warr," by the British officer of Sir John Clotworthy's regiment, a passage occurs which seems to favour Leland's view of the *period* at which the slaughter took place on Island Magee. He writes, that *about Christmas* [1641] a certain Captain Lindsay, with forty horsemen, all of whom had previously lived at Tullaghoge "came to us at Antrim. They had left their wives and children and goods with the enemy [the Irish], and *concluding* that they had been all destroyed, in revenge," says the writer, "they could not endure to see any Irishman, but they must beat him to destroy him. So one night they left Antrim, their garrison, unknown to all the officers but their own Lieutenant, Barnet Lindsay, and fell on Mr. Upton's tenants, a gentleman who hated to see or hear innocent blood drawn, and would save them if he could, but was then in Carrickfergus; and they murdered about eighty persons, men, women and children, near Templepatrick; at which other Scots took example and did the like at Island Magee. *Then* the Irish on the other side, in the county of Antrim, to be revenged, spared not to destroy the Scottish where they could get advantage."‡

* In the passage quoted above, only a portion of which is quoted by Leland.

† *Leland's History of Ireland*. Vol. III. 4to Edition. London, 1773, p. 123. Leland is quite at fault here. Carte distinctly says, in the passage quoted above, that he had examined those papers.

‡ "History of the Warr of Ireland," pp. 8 and 9. Although the above passage seems to transfer the Island Magee affair from November, 1641, to the end of December or beginning of January following, it contradicts Mr. Leland on some important points. 1. According to the English officer, the slaughter on Island Magee was not in retaliation for previous slaughters by the Irish, but resulted from the murder of Mr. Upton's [Irish] tenants by the Scots, from which other Scots took example and did the like on Island Magee. 2. These two massacres are given by the English officer as the reason why the Irish "spared not to destroy" the Scots wherever they could find them, although they had previously by proclamation made it death to interfere with Scots either in person or property.

In the following passage he asserts that not only the massacre on Island Magee, but several others were perpetrated by the Scotch before the Irish did any more than take forts and castles. Having touched upon the Rising and taking of Charlemont Fort, the writer proceeds:—"Soon after this the Scots in the North began their bloody massacres in the counties of Down and Antrim, at Island Magee, Ballydevy, Clonleck, Cumber, Gallagher, and Magheravorn, 500 poor souls destroyed without regard to age or sex, and that before one drop of blood was spilt by any Roman Catholick; though afterwards, when those unparalleled murders were known, some of the loosest of the Irish rabble, being exasperated thereat, did, by way of retaliation, murder some British at Portadown, Clonean, Curbridge, and Belurbet."*

* An impartial relation of the most memorable transactions of General Owen O'Neill and his party, from the year 1641 to the year 1650. Collected by Colonel Henry McTuoll O'Neill. Vid: "Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland," vol. III., pp. 196-7. The slaughter at Portadown has been much dwelt on by English and protestant writers. "One hundred and ninety," says Leland, "were at once precipitated from the bridge of Portadown," (vol. 3, p. 127). Temple fixes the number at *one thousand*, men, women and children (Hist. 4to Ed., p. 87). And, he adds, other relations gave it that four thousand persons were drowned "within the several parts of the county" (Ibid). "The most notorious [slaughter] was at Portadown, in the County of Armagh, as all Ulster says, and the most that were there drowned and smothered exceed not *ninety persons*, for which some were hanged, as they well deserved, at the High Court of Justice at Carrickfergus in the year 1653." *The History of the Warr of Ireland from 1641 to 1653, by a British Officer of Sir John Clotworthy's Regiment*, pp. 7 & 8. Dublin, 1873.

THE APPARITIONS AT PORTADOWN BRIDGE.

The alleged appearance of the spirits of those who were drowned at Portadown must have inflamed the minds of the protestants of Ulster to a state of frenzy. In the depositions taken on this strange subject, the deponents commonly say, *they were told about the matter by the rebels*; even Dr. Maxwell, protestant archdeacon of Down, and afterwards bishop of Kilmore, does not pretend that he saw any of the apparitions, although he seems to give them full credence, for he says, "he had as much certainty as could morally be required of such matters." (See his *Exam. in Temple and Borlase*.) I have found the depositions of two protestant women who swore they themselves saw apparitions in the river. Catherine, relict of William Cole, swore, that, nine days after the drowning, "she saw a vision or spirit in the shape of a man, as she apprehended, that appeared in that river, in the place of the drowning, bolt upright, breast high, with hands lifted up and stood in that posture there, until the latter end of Lent next following." Surely, Dr. Maxwell, who did not live far from Portadown, had he the least desire to verify the story of the visions, might have travelled a few miles to see the one that remained so long visible. Mrs. Elizabeth Price deposed, that, hearing of the apparitions, she went one evening about twilight, when all on a sudden she saw a vision or spirit, "assuming the shape of a woman—with elevated hands, her hair hanging down very white; her eyes seemed to twinkle, and her skin as white as snow; which spirit seemed to stand up straight in the water, often repeated the word, *Revenge, Revenge, Revenge*." See *Examinations touching apparitions in Temple*, p. 128. 4to Ed.

Leland, as we have already seen, on the authority of original depositions in the possession of the University of Dublin, says that the massacre in Island Magee was committed in the beginning of January, 1642, "when," he adds, "the followers of O'Neill had almost exhausted their barbarous malice."* This charge against the followers of Sir Phelim O'Neill does not seem to be fully sustained by the facts of the case. The leaders of the Rising proclaimed in the very beginning that (1) they would not molest any of the Scotch nation residing in Ireland; (2) that they would avoid the shedding of blood. On this second point Warner writes:—"It [the Rising] was merely a plot of the native Irish to restore their religion to its former splendour, and to recover the estates and power of their ancestors that were forcibly usurped, and, in their opinion unjustly occupied by the English. Whatever cruelties are to be charged upon them in the prosecution of their undertaking—and they are numerous and horrid—yet their first intention, we see, went no further than to strip the English and the protestants of their power and possessions, and, *unless forced to it* by opposition, not to shed any blood."† It must be admitted that declarations and undertakings of this kind are not unfrequently violated—violated, too, by subordinates without the knowledge and even against the known wishes of their leaders. Still we have no reliable evidence to prove that those undertakings were disregarded in the earliest stages of the Rising. Indeed we have some important testimony to the contrary; negative testimony, to be sure, but still, of its kind, strong and reliable.

On the 23rd of December, 1641, just two months after the Rising, the Lords Justices Parsons and Borlase, issued a Commission to Henry Jones, Dean of Kilmore, and others, to enquire into the transactions which took place in Ulster during those two months. In this important document the Lords-Justices do not assume that there were any great slaughters during the time, as many Protestant writers have asserted; they empower the Commissioners to examine witnesses upon oath, as to such "robberies and spoils as had been committed," and at what times; and even, "what traitorous or disloyal words, speeches or actions, were then or at any time uttered or committed by those robbers or any of them, and how often;

It is surely well nigh a hopeless task to extract the real facts of history from books, in which depositions and apparitions such as the above are put forward with solemn gravity.

* Vol. III., p. 129.

† History of the Civil War in Ireland, p. 47. See also Leland, Vol. III., p. 101.

and all other circumstances concerning the said particulars, and every of them."* The Commissioners "did very seriously address themselves to the work," and found that "many gentlemen of good estates were discovered to be the chief actors in the depredations of the British, and to have committed many most horrid murders, which, through their [the Commissioners'] industry will now remain upon record."†

It is worthy of note that neither the word "rebellion," nor "slaughter," occurs in the Commission drawn up by the Lords Justices, for the guidance of the Commissioners. It is prepared in the usual way of a legal document, to be used and acted upon in places where the King's writ ran. It authorized the taking of evidence upon oath, which evidence was to be digested into a report, and presented, in due time, to the said Justices. The Report was accordingly presented, and the strongest expression which it contains is that "many horrid murders and other cruelties were committed"—wicked crimes, no doubt, but such as would be almost sure to accompany robberies of an extensive kind. Had there occurred those vast and dreadful slaughters spoken of by Protestant writers, the Report of the Commissioners, as it stands, would be utterly false and misleading. The Commissioners were all protestants, with a protestant dignitary at their head, and it is not at all likely that their Report would fail to put forward to the full the alleged slaughters had they been perpetrated. In face of this Report of the King's Commissioners, what can honest men think of Lord Clarendon's assertion that in the first two or three days of the Rising, forty or fifty thousand of the British were destroyed? or of Temple's, that in the first two months of it, one hundred and fifty thousand protestants were massacred in cold blood?

There were exaggerations on the other side too, but as far as I can see not such gross ones. For instance, there is, as I think can be shown, a considerable exaggeration of the numbers murdered on Island Magee by the Scotch garrison of Castle-fergus [Carrickfergus]. The Catholic writers on the subject commonly assert that 3,000 men, women and children were slaughtered in that Peninsula on the dreadful occasion, who, as Leland admits, "were unoffending and untainted by the rebellion." He further says, "If we can believe one of the leaders of this party [the Scotch], thirty families were assailed by them in

* Commission given in Temple, pp. 141-2.

† Ibid, p. 142.

their beds, and massacred with calm and deliberate cruelty."* Leland seems to have had no accurate knowledge of Island Magee, as he calls it "a small and thinly-inhabited neck of land." It is by no means small; it is as large as an ordinary sized parish; is a parish at present, and according to the Ordnance Survey contains 7,036½ statute acres of excellent land, in a high state of cultivation. As all the inhabitants of Island Magee were slaughtered by the soldiers from Carrickfergus, we have above the maximum, and it may be assumed, the minimum of its supposed population in 1641, namely, 3,000 as the maximum, and 30 families, equal to from 150 to 170 persons, as the minimum. Let us examine both statements by the only test we have; the test of the population of Ireland at different periods.

It is a reasonable assumption that the population of the divisions of a country bear a proportion to its total population, unless some disturbing cause intervene. As I find no such disturbing cause in the case of Island Magee, I shall test its population in 1641 by this rule. Sir William Petty who, Carte says, "had an head excellently turned for calculations," is the only authority we have on the population of Ireland in 1641. His account of it is not, of course, founded on a real census, but on his knowledge of the country, which was very extensive, and on his own computations. He makes the whole population of Ireland in 1641, 2,200,000 souls. For comparison, I take the total population in 1841, (the largest derived from an actual census) which was, in round numbers, 8,200,000: the population of Island Magee, as given in the census of the same year, is 2,782. The entire population of Ireland in 1841 was nearly four times as great as it was in 1641, which will reduce the population of Island Magee, in that year, to about 700, or a small fraction less. Thus is dissipated the assertion of the Irish writers that 3,000 Catholics were slaughtered there, in 1641. At the same time, the murder of 600 or 700 unoffending people in cold blood, and at the dead of night, must still be regarded as a dreadful butchery.†

Leland vehemently asserts that the murders on Island Magee were provoked by the wholesale massacres perpetrated on the protestants by Sir Phelim O'Neill; hence it is very important to his view of the case to place the slaughter in Island Magee,

* History of Ireland, Vol. III., p. 128, 4to Ed.

† The population of Ireland in 1821 was 6,801,827, that of Island Magee, 2,299; which figures show the proportion in 1821 to be pretty much the same as in 1841, the difference being, that the population of Island Magee, as compared with the entire population, had increased somewhat in the twenty years. This information I personally applied for and obtained at the Census Office, Charlemont House.

in January, 1642, instead of November, 1641, inasmuch as this arrangement gives more time for Sir Phelim to commit his slaughters, and also for the protestants to hear of them. This postponement, however, of two months does not serve Leland's view so much as he seems to have imagined. He says, that the massacre of the inhabitants of Island Magee "was really committed in the beginning of January, when the followers of O'Neill *had almost exhausted* their barbarous malice."* Now one of Temple's selected witnesses, Captain Parkin, "deposeth, that Sir Phelim O'Neill, flying from Dundalk, went to Armagh, where *he began* his bloody massacres."† The time at which Sir Phelim, in company with Colonel Plunket, fled from Dundalk, is fixed to a certainty by the dates of letters referred to in Carte's Ormonde. One is a letter of the 4th of March, the other of the 12th of the same month. We learn from the context that it was between these two dates the flight from Dundalk occurred; that event being nearer to the 12th than the 4th. It requires no argument to show that massacres committed by O'Neill in March, could not have occasioned the murders on Island Magee in the previous January. No doubt the followers of O'Neill had committed many depredations before March, but it is most incorrect and misleading to say the slaughter on Island Magee was not perpetrated until the followers of O'Neill had nearly exhausted their barbarous malice. Besides, we know from the history of the time that it did not require any great provocation to induce puritan soldiers to kill papists, believing as they did, that eternal rewards awaited them for such meritorious service in the cause of God.‡

* History of Ireland, Vol. 3, p. 129. 4to Ed.

† Temple, p. 88. 4to Ed.

‡ One of the crimes most persistently charged against Sir Phelim O'Neill is that he ordered Lord Charlemont to be shot, the aged nobleman being at the time his prisoner and under his protection. Borlase says of Sir Phelim, that "he had surprised Charlemont, where the Lord Caulfield lay with his foot company, and afterwards basely butchered him."—*History of the execrable Irish Rebellion*, p. 43. "Sir Philemy and his myrmidons were mightily enraged at this defeat [at Drogheda], and in revenge murdered the Lord Caulfield and Mr. Blaney."—*Cox, Vol. II.*, p. 93. "The defeat at Lisburn provoked this savage and his barbarous followers to a degree of rage truly diabolical. Lord Caulfield who had been conveyed to one of the houses of O'Neill was wantonly and basely murdered."—Leland's *History of Ireland*, Vol. III., p. 127. "On any news of ill success he [Sir Phelim] would immediately order all his prisoners to be murdered, or some other act of barbarous and senseless vengeance to be committed. In one of these fits, he ordered Mr. Blaney, Knight of the Shire of Monahan, to be hanged in his own garden; and the old Lord Charlemont to be shot."—*History of the Rebellion and Civil War in Ireland*. By F. Warner, LL.D., p. 107. Here is Mr. Prendergast's account of the shooting of Lord Charlemont "Sir Phelim O'Neill is handed down by history as the murderer of Caulfield,

Sir Phelim O'Neill's wonderful series of successes during the first few weeks after he took the field, must, in a great degree, be attributed to the fact that the Rising seems to have been unexpected by the Irish Government, which was, therefore, panic-stricken. Besides which, some of their own historians have accused the Lords Justices of wilful neglect in the matter, and of not putting forth the power of the Government with proper zeal, after recovering from their first surprise; a charge which appears to be true. And the motive which, according to the same historian, influenced them to pursue this course, would appear to be equally certain. It was the desire of large forfeitures for the aggrandisement of themselves and their friends. Another reason for their inactivity, but one not put forward by their friends, is that whilst Parsons and Borlase were ostensibly the King's representatives in Ireland, they were really the friends and servants of his enemies the Puritans. They had to fight the Irish leaders in the King's name, and apparently for his interests, for which they cared nothing; the Irish on the other hand, proclaimed that they were fighting for their King, and for freedom of worship on their own behalf. The Lords Justices knew that the King believed his Irish subjects were not unfriendly to him, and that if they crushed the Rising quickly and triumphantly, he would, in all likelihood, come to terms with them, and even grant them those Graces so often promised and withheld; an act the Lords Justices by no means desired. What they wanted was that the King and the Irish Catholics should go down together, and that Puritanism should be set up on the ruins of both. The King himself more than indicates his reliance on his Irish Catholic subjects, when he writes:—"I would to God no man had been less affected with Ireland's sad estate than myself. I offered to go, myself in person, upon that expedition; *but some men were either afraid I should have any one kingdom quieted; or loth they were to shoot at any mark here, less*

his neighbour in the country, and his friend in Parliament. Yet he treated him and his family with great care, when he surprised the fort of Charlemont, on the 23rd of October, 1641, and there Lord Caulfield was kept until the 14th of January, 1642, when he was sent with an escort towards Cloughouter Castle by a similar order, probably from Kilkenny, to that which brought Bishop Bede, thither. They were to rest the first night at Phelim O'Neill's manor of Kynard (now Caledon); but as Lord Caulfield was entering the gate, he was shot in the back by Edmond O'Hugh, a foster brother of Sir Phelim. That Sir Phelim had no part in this murder is certain, for he was sorely distressed at it, and had O'Hugh committed to Armagh jail for trial for the murder; but he escaped, whereupon Sir Phelim had the sentry hanged for his connivance or neglect."—*Cromwellian Settlement*, p. 63. See contemporary authorities in foot note to above, from which it appears Sir Phelim was from home at the time Lord Caulfield was shot.

*than myself; or that any should have the glory of my destruction but themselves. Had my many offers been accepted, I am confident neither the ruin had been so great, nor the calamity so long, nor the remedy so desperate.”**

Sir Phelim, having met several reverses in Ulster, marched southward and besieged Drogheda, in the opening days of 1642. He remained before that important place until the first week in March, when, having failed to take it, he returned to Dundalk. The two chief commanders who defended Drogheda against him were Sir Henry Tichborne and Lord Moore. The former relates, with evident pleasure and pious thankfulness (this last quality was always ostentatiously paraded by him), how, on one occasion Lord Moore forced the rebels from a position of advantage near Killanure, killed four hundred of them, amongst whom were seven captains, Art Roe M'Mahon having been taken prisoner, “whose head,” Sir Henry quaintly remarks, “*was valued* in the proclamation to the taker or bringer in of him at four hundred pounds.”† Sir Henry and Lord Moore pursued O'Neill to Dundalk, which they took by storm, and so Sir Phelim was obliged to withdraw from it under cover of the night, whence he proceeded to Armagh. It was during this march or rather flight he is said by Captain Parkin, to have *begun* “his bloody massacres.” The account of the burning of Armagh and the slaughter there, depends chiefly on the testimony of Captain Parkin. His words are:—“That Sir Phelim O'Neill, flying from Dundalk went to Armagh, where he began his bloody massacres, causing Manus O'Cane to get together all the protestants which were left thereabouts, to conduct them to Coleraine; but before they were scarce a day's journey from him, they were all murdered, and so were several others by special direction from Sir Phelim O'Neill and his brother Turlogh, notwithstanding they were protected by them [i.e. under their guaranteed protection]. All the aged people in Armagh were, by the same direction, carried away, but murdered also at Charlemont. And pre-

* Eikon Basilike, p. 82, Ed. 1648. I quote the Eikon unconditionally as the King's work, because it seems to me that the Editor of the London Edition of 1880, places the matter beyond dispute. In answer to the Declaration presented to him, 9th March, 1642, his Majesty said:—“The business of Ireland will never be done in the way that you are in; four hundred will never do that work. It must be put into the hands of one. If I were trusted with it, I will pawn my head to end that work. And though I am a beggar myself, yet [*speaking with a strong asseveration*], I can find money for that.” No doubt Charles could have ended it, but Parsons, Borlase, and the Puritans did not want it ended. *Reb. 9, Sac. Car.* p. 24.

† History of the Siege of Drogheda, by Sir Henry Tichborne, p. 10.

sently after, his brother and he with their adherents, maliciously set on fire the goodly cathedral church of Armagh, and town of Armagh, and murdered and drowned there 500 persons young and old.* On the above passage Mr. Stuart, a protestant and an Armagh man, makes the following remarks: "This account, though solemnly sworn to by Captain Parkin, seems evidently a mixture of truth and falsehood. It is certain that Sir Phelim set fire to the city and the cathedral. But it is incredible that he would have despatched any of his prisoners to Coleraine, which was then in possession of the Anglo-Scots. If he had merely intended to murder them, for what object did he send them a day's journey from Armagh, since he had not scrupled to slay other persons in the city itself? Neither is it likely that, when he found the enemy advancing, he would have wasted his time in drowning prisoners, whom he might have despatched in a more expeditious manner. *There is no deep river in the city, in which he could have suddenly plunged the victims of his barbarity.*"†

The Author of the Aphorismical Discovery, who was very favourable to the Catholic cause, says, the decline of Sir Phelim O'Neill's affairs began with his assumption of the title of Earl of Tyrone, to which he had no strict claim. In his vanity, he believed it would aid his cause and rally the whole province of Ulster round him, but in this he deceived himself, for it alienated many of his followers, especially the lesser chieftains, who saw, as they thought, in this proceeding an attempt to lord it over them.‡ But other very important things conspired against him; for, whilst his army was for the most part broken into skirmishing parties, and the few strong places yet in his hands were without ammunition or provisions, 2,500 Scots, under Major-General Robert Monroe, landed at Carrickfergus about the middle of April, and towards the close of the same month these were reinforced by 1,800 foot, five troops of horse and two of dragoons, under Lord Conway and Colonel Chichester. This raised the troops in Ulster to 12,000 men, which army, according to the Lords Justices, was soon to be increased to 19,000.§

* Temple's History of the Irish Rebellion, p. 88. 4to Ed.

† Historical Memoirs of the City of Armagh, by James Stuart, A.B. Newry, 1819. The italics are mine. J. O'R.

‡ Aphorismical Discovery, vol. 1, p. 34. The precursor of General Owen O'Neill, Daniel O'Kane, who landed in Ireland before him, "a Hector in arms," denounced in good set terms Sir Phelim's assumption of the title of Tyrone, being "madd angree" at it.

§ Carte's Ormonde, vol. I., p. 309. The consternation caused among the Irish, especially those of the Pale, by the landing of the Scots is evident from

The affairs of the Irish had become desperate, and their leaders began to shift for themselves as best they could, yet, on account of the strange conduct of Monroe in not pursuing them in their broken and demoralized condition, they rallied and fought a very sharp battle against Sir W. and Sir Robert Stewart, on the 28th of June, at a place near Raphoe, in which they were defeated, leaving about 500 dead on the field, and many wounded. Borlase, with his usual exaggeration, says, nearly two thousand were slain.

In this supreme crisis of the Irish and Catholic cause an express arrived from Colonel Owen O'Neill to Sir Phelim, that after a tedious passage from Dunkirke, he had landed in Donegal with a number of veteran officers and soldiers of his own regiment, and a good quantity of arms and ammunition; that he had taken possession of Castledoe, on the coast, where he intended to remain until a sufficient force was sent to convey him to the Irish quarters. He also informed Sir Phelim that he had sent the Saint Francis (his ship) with a further supply of military stores to Wexford. The news of Owen O'Neill's arrival spread rapidly over Ulster, and the people, gaining confidence, flocked in to Sir Phelim's standard, so that he soon had about 1500 men, with whom he proceeded to Donegal, whence he conducted Owen to the strong fort of Charlemont, where he was chosen General-in-Chief of the Irish army. And thus, when all seemed lost, there was vouchsafed to a broken cause, a General who had no equal amongst the military leaders, on either side, then in Ireland.*

During the first six weeks of the Insurrection, it was confined to Ulster, where the success of Sir Phelim O'Neill was surprising and immediate. For the clearness of my narrative I considered

the following passage :—" Lord Slane to Lord Gormanston, 10th April, 1642— ' My Lord, sithence my coming home I have heard certain intelligence that there are 3,000 Scots landed with Colonel Munro, and 7,000 more daily expected. My Lord of Ardes hath 5,000 ready to join with them. Sir Phelim hath but a firkin and a half of powder, so as unless you procure Terence Coaghlan his sudden despatch of those letters to the State, we are all undone. Therefore I shall earnestly desire that your Lordship delay no time, but instantly send for him, and not alter, my cousin Plunket or Sir William Hill being the fittest men to go. Tirlagh O'Neill is of the same opinion, and thinks it most necessary, being assured his brother [Sir Phelim] will be very glad of it, and all those that are engaged in this unfortunate business. If you omit this opportunity, I doubt not of sudden ruin, which I hope may be prevented by taking this course." *From the contents of Lord Gormanston's cabinet, captured at Lord Ringal's, in the County of Cavan, 17th April, 1643. Account of the Carte MSS., in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, p. 198, London, 1871.*

* He was, says Clarendon, "in subtilty and understanding much superior to the whole nation of the old Irish, a great discerner of men's natures and humours, of good experience in the most active armies of that time, and of a courage very notorious."

it my best course to follow his fortunes up to the time he ceased to be leader-in-chief—an arrangement which compelled me to leave several important matters untouched, more especially (1) the conduct of the Lords Justices in the management of the war; (2) the accession of the Palesmen to the ranks of the old Irish some time after they took up arms; and (3) the Rising in Munster and Connaught, and the causes which led to it.

The Lords Justices were Parsons and Borlase, the latter an experienced soldier of fair repute, but now old and desirous of his ease. He was a mere cypher in the government; Sir William Parsons was—the Lords Justices. He was an Englishman of mean extraction; his education consisted of reading and writing only, the writing being such a miserable scrawl, that it could scarcely be called writing, and was impossible to be deciphered, except by himself. With such acquirements and about £40 in his pocket, he came to Ireland to seek his fortune. He obtained some employment under the Escheator-General. After some time he obtained the hand of the Surveyor-General's niece in marriage, and that functionary having resigned soon after, Parsons succeeded him as Surveyor-General. His fortune was made. As Surveyor-General he had the measurement of the escheated lands; and as a commissioner of the lands escheated, another post which he managed to secure, he had a great hand in the disposal of those lands. The first thing he seems to have done as Surveyor-General was to measure off eighteen hundred acres in Ulster; and the next thing he seems to have done as commissioner of escheated lands, was to confer those eighteen hundred acres on himself. What liberal measurement he must have given in the case! After this success, grant after grant poured in upon him. "He had, in his early days, imbibed the sentiments of the Puritans; and had all that gravity in his exterior, which is often mistaken for true wisdom, of which it is only the semblance. Though he owed the posts which had enabled him to amass his riches, and the grants of his estate, to the king's bounty, yet being still as selfish and greedy of wealth as ever, and finding his Majesty's power was sunk in that of the Parliament, he struck into their measures, and by their recommendation was made one of the Lords Justices."*

I. Many of the writers who treat of the Rising of 1641 accept it as a fact that the Lords Justices were in profound ignorance of the preparations of the Irish for that attempt; so that this ignorance caused them to be so paralysed by O'Connell's revelations, that they were unable at once to take such

* Warner's *Rebellion and Civil Wars in Ireland*, pp. 49-50. See also Carte.

measures as the occasion imperatively demanded. Carte does not accept this as a sufficient explanation of the tardiness of their movements. He charges them with culpable negligence, not, says he, easily to be accounted for, but which it is utterly impossible to excuse;* inasmuch, that they had received repeated warnings on the subject.

1. The King had received accounts from his representatives at the Court of Spain, and other foreign Courts that "an unspeakable number of Irish churchmen" had passed from Spain and other parts to England and Ireland; and also some "good old soldiers, under pretext of asking to raise men for the King of Spain; whereas it is observed among the Irish friars there, a whisper runs as if they expected a rebellion in Ireland." His majesty therefore puts the Lords Justices on their guard about the matter, who were to use "especial care and watchfulness with regard to it."† This letter bears date the 16th of March, 1641, more than seven months before the attempt on the Castle of Dublin, which was the first act of the Insurrection.

2. Sir William Cole in a letter dated "Enniskillen, October 11th," addressed to the Lords Justices and sent to them by express, warned them of an "unusual resort of people to Sir Phelim O'Neill's house, the frequent private journeys of Lord Maguire thither, to Dublin and other places; his many despatches in great hurry to different persons, to meet at his seat; his pretending to raise men for the King of Spain's service, and to nominate captains under him to do the like; and his pitching upon such as were men of broken fortunes, and the likeliest to be concerned in any mischief that was intended, of which the suspicions were very strong." Sir William having received information of the design of seizing the Castle of Dublin, despatched another express to the Lords Justices "with notice thereof; but this second letter the Justices pretended never came to their hands," although, when afterwards questioned on the subject, they would not say how or where it was intercepted.‡

3. Had the Lords Justices cared to be vigilant, many things happened in the city itself which were sufficient to excite their suspicions, and to make them be on the alert, especially as Sir Henry Vane's letter, and Sir William Cole's dispatch were in their hands. They knew that private meetings were held for the raising of soldiers, ostensibly for foreign service, and the men so raised were marched to Dublin unmolested, where the officers

* Carte's *Life of the Duke of Ormonde*, Vol. I., p. 165.

† *Ibid.*, Vol. III., p. 30, where the letter is given in full.

‡ Carte, Vol. I., pp. 166-7.

who had come from abroad, and whom the Lords Justices were warned to watch, held meetings among themselves, and also in conjunction with some of the Irish chiefs. And all this time, they "never took a step, either to discover the design or to prevent the mischiefs of which they had been forewarned, and which immediately followed."*

II. The English Pale was the English garrison—the English power in Ireland. Some of the Pale families intermarried with the families of native chieftains, and having adopted Ireland as their country, acquired strong Irish feelings; they even grew rebellious, and opposed English authority, at times; but this was of a transient nature, and was done in defence of what they regarded as their *English* rights and liberties, and in opposition to governors, who attempted to treat them as they treated the mere Irish. But the Palesmen were thoroughly loyal to the British Crown, and were its bulwark here. Even the change of religion did not affect their loyalty; in their Declarations and Remonstrances they made the free exercise of their religion and their loyalty to the Crown one and the same; they complained of grievances and with much cause, but they sought redress through constitutional channels only. I therefore agree with those historians who hold that the Palesmen were not concerned in, and not cognisant of, the Insurrection which commenced on the 23rd of October, 1641. Colonel Plunket, indeed, undertook to sound the Lords of the Pale about the Rising, and to treat with them on the subject, but, says Carte, "As the undertaking was the effect of his vanity, so the success did not answer his wishes; and as to what general discourse he pretended to have had with Lord Gormanstown and others of the committee in London, it cannot reasonably be supposed to relate to this conspiracy, of which he was entirely ignorant, and had been at that time so long absent from his own country, that he was very ill qualified to propose anything that regarded it, to gentlemen who knew it infinitely better than himself, and were taking, with success, their own way of redressing all the grievances, whereof they had any occasion to complain."†

The desire of the Lords Justices was, from the first, to get the Palesmen into rebellion, because, whilst the possessions still remaining to the old Irish were, for the most part, inferior and unimproved, the three or four counties of the Pale consisted of some of the richest and fairest lands in the kingdom. Besides the owners of them were rich, so that forfeitures in the Pale were

* Carte, Vol. I., p. 167.

† Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., pp. 164-5. MS. Memoirs of Mr. Plunket.

just the things to excite the yearning greed of a man like Parsons; since this territory was far superior to the Ranelaghs of which he had robbed the O'Byrnes not long before. Moreover, the Palesmen were thorough Catholics and loyal subjects to the King; so that the Lords Justices could not perform a more acceptable service to the Puritans, who were the King's enemies and their own sworn friends, than to include the Catholic loyalists of the Pale in the rebellion.

The Lords Justices, writing to the Lord Lieutenant, the Earl of Leicester, boast that on discovering the conspiracy, they sat up all the night of the 23rd of October in consultation; which was true. But whilst they were consulting, nearly all the leaders of the attack on the castle escaped. Whereas had they taken prompt, decisive action, and seized them, the rising of 1641 would never have attained the magnitude it did. The outcome of the consultation was a proclamation which, either through accident or design, seemed to include in the insurrection *all* the Catholics of Ireland. The Catholics of the Pale took alarm at this, and called on the Lords Justices for an explanation of the following opening sentence in the Proclamation:—"These are to make known and publish to all his Majesty's good subjects in this Kingdom of Ireland, that there is a discovery made by us, the Lords Justices and Council, of a most disloyal and detestable conspiracy intended by some evil-affected Irish papists against the lives of us, the Lords Justices and Council, and many other of his Majesty's faithful subjects, universally throughout this Kingdom."* To satisfy the Palesmen the Lords Justices had to publish an explanatory Proclamation a few days after, to the effect that by the above words they only meant the old Irish of Ulster and such as adhered to them, and did not thereby mean any of the old English of the Pale, nor of any other parts of the Kingdom.†

In 1640 Committees of the Irish Houses of Lords and Commons had proceeded to England to place before his Majesty the grievances of this Kingdom. This they did during a sojourn of nine months there, and as they afterwards gratefully acknowledged the King listened to them "very often with very great patience."‡ During those nine months the Lords Justices, through the Puritan party in England, thwarted the Irish Committees as far as they could, and did what in them lay to render their

* Temple's Irish Rebellion, p. 22.

† Ibid. p. 35.

‡ See Remonstrance from Trim in Plowden's Appendix to Vol. I. of his Historical Review, p. 86.

appeal to the King abortive. But in spite of them the Committees were successful. By Poyning's law, the Irish Parliament could not entertain any bill until it was first approved of by the English Privy Council; and the object of the Committees of the Irish Houses was, through the King's influence, to obtain that sanction to bills which they had brought with them from Ireland. Amongst those bills were two of vast importance. The first was the Act of Limitation, which settled beyond question on the possessors all estates throughout the Kingdom that had been quietly enjoyed without claim or interruption for sixty years immediately preceding; the second was for causing to be relinquished his Majesty's right and title to four counties in Connaught, to Clare, and great tracts of land in Tipperary and Limerick which were found for him by the inquisitions of Wentworth, (who allowed no limits to the King's claims), and then were ready to be disposed of, upon survey, to British undertakers, as was done in the case of the six counties of Ulster. This bill further confirmed to the existing owners possession of their estates in the various counties.*

These, with the other Graces formerly promised were "to be passed in due form, when the two Houses should meet after their adjournment; and in the meantime care was taken to notify them to the whole nation. Briefs were sent to all the ports in the Kingdom of those Graces which related to the Customs, particularly whatever concerned wool and tobacco, with orders to put them immediately in execution, though there wanted the formality of their being passed into Acts. And the Lords Justices affected to show, on their part, a readiness in drawing up and dispatching the bills they were directed to prepare, and a cheerful compliance with his Majesty's gracious intentions for the ease, benefit, and satisfaction of his people."† The Lords Justices, besides the opposition they gave in England to the granting of the Graces, organized a faction in the Irish Parliament against them, which faction "after certain knowledge that the said Committees were by the waterside in England, with sundry important and beneficial bills, and other Graces, to be passed as Acts in that Parliament, of purpose to prevent the same, the said faction, by the practice of the said Lords Justices, and some of the said Privy Council and their adherents, in a tumultuous and disorderly manner, on the 7th day of August, 1641, and on several days before, cried out for an adjournment of the House; and being over-voted by the voice of the more moderate

* See Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 152.

† Ibid.

party, the said Lords Justices and their adherents told several honourable peers, that if they did not adjourn the Lords' House on that day, being Saturday, that they themselves would prorogue or adjourn the Parliament on the next Monday following, by means whereof, and of great numbers of proxies of noblemen, not estated, nor at any time resident in this Kingdom.....the Lords' House was, on the said seventh day of August adjourned, and the House of Commons by occasion thereof, and of the faction aforesaid, adjourned soon after; by which means those bills and Graces, according to your Majesty's intention, and the great expectation and longing desires of your people, could not then pass as Acts of Parliament."* Thus, by the villainy and cupidity of the Lords Justices, Parsons and Borlase, two of the greatest enemies of their King and his loyal Irish subjects, a great "message of peace" was rendered nugatory—a message which, in all likelihood, would have prevented the shedding of those torrents of blood that resulted from the Insurrection of the October following.

As soon as the news of the attack on the Castle reached the Lords of the Pale, they hastened to Dublin, waited on the Lords Justices, declared their devoted loyalty to the King, and asked for arms to defend themselves and to assist in putting down the Insurrection. The Lords Justices showed but little inclination to supply them with arms, declaring that they were ignorant of the quantity of arms in the stores of the Castle, but feared they were only sufficient for the defence of the city and the castle itself. Some arms, however, they gave, but little more than what was required to protect the residences of the peers who had applied for them; the only person who got an extra supply was Lord Gormanston, because he was most exposed to the attacks of the insurgents, and because he was empowered to "raise forces to kill and destroy the rebels and to execute them according to martial law." But the quantity of arms he received was quite insufficient for the duties imposed on him, being only five hundred in all, partly muskets and partly pikes. Stinted as the supply of arms given to the

* Remonstrance from Trim, *loco citato*. Cox's account of this forced adjournment is an admirable specimen of his adroit knavery. He says: "In the meantime, it being convenient to give the members a short recess, to attend their harvest, and their other occasions, and there being no sudden expectation of the Irish Committees' return from England, the Parliament, by their own consent, was, on the 7th of August, adjourned to the 9th of November." *Hibernia Anglicana*, vol. 2., p. 72. On the breaking out of the Insurrection in October the Lords Justices prorogued (by Proclamation) the Parliament which was to meet on November 9th to February the 24th, 1642; a proceeding most injurious to the King's interest, and held by the best lawyers to be illegal.

Palesmen was, it seems to have been done under the influence of the sudden panic occasioned by the attack on the castle, and the Lords Justices, having recovered somewhat from their fright, repented of their action in the matter, and resolved to take back those arms on the first opportunity which presented itself.

They had already written to England for supplies of men, arms, and ammunition, and when their letters were read in the English House of Commons, the supplies demanded were at once granted, with a promise of future supplies, as they might be required. This news elated the Lords Justices very much, and they spread it as rapidly as they could throughout the kingdom. One would suppose that under these circumstances, they would feel themselves in a position to give additional arms to the loyalists of the Pale; but the intelligence had quite the opposite effect upon them, for they at once, on the arrival of the good news, resolved to take back the arms they had already given to the Palesmen; in pursuance of which resolution, they sent an order to Sir Henry Tichborne, then at Drogheda, to reclaim, in their names, the arms supplied to Lord Gormanston and the rest. Thereupon he proceeded early on the morning of the 17th of November to Lord Gormanston's residence, seized on the arms, and had them conveyed to Drogheda guarded by two companies of foot-soldiers. The arms which had fallen into private hands were more difficult to secure, but as far as it could be done, they were taken as soon as possible. Thus, did those Puritan Lords Justices give mortal offence to the people of the whole English Pale, who were as loyal to the King as any subject in his realm, but this loyalty was, of course, a criminal thing in the eyes of the Lords Justices, who were entirely guided by private correspondence with the Puritan party in England.*

The Prorogation of Parliament by Proclamation of the Lords Justices, from November the 9th to February the 24th,

* When Ormonde had made up his mind that nothing could save the King's army but a cessation of hostilities, the Puritan party, especially Parsons, opposed a cessation, lest it should injure the interests of the English Parliamentarians. This traitor to his King was soon accused of high crimes and misdemeanours, especially that of holding private correspondence with the Puritans, unknown to the King. After Parsons was arrested, Ormonde thus writes to the Earl of Clanrickarde:—"Mr. Brent landed lately here, and hath brought with him such letters as have something changed the face of the Government from what it was *when the Parliament pamphlets were received as oracles, their commands obeyed as laws, and extirpation preached for gospel.*" Carte's Ormonde, Vol. III., p. 170. The italics in the above extract are mine. J. O'R.

incensed all well-disposed people, but it especially incensed the Catholics who were anxiously looking forward to a Parliamentary confirmation of the Graces which had been granted to them by the King, and which were then actually in the hands of the Committee that had been sent to England by the Irish Parliament. The legality of the Prorogation was called in question, and some Members, who were lawyers, declared that "unless the two Houses met on the day to which they were adjourned, the Parliament would be dissolved notwithstanding the said Proclamation."* The Government lawyers seemed pressed by this objection, and did not venture to give it a distinct contradiction; so to tide over the difficulty, the Lords Justices consented to a meeting of both Houses on November the 16th, saying that "though they could by no means absolutely remove the Prorogation, yet, they would comply so far for their satisfaction, as to limit it to a shorter time; and that at present they would give them leave to sit *one whole day*, in case they would immediately fall upon the work of making a protestation against the Rebels; and that they should have liberty (if they pleased) to depute some members of their own House to treat with the Rebels about their laying down of arms; and that the Council would be ready to receive whatever grievances these Rebels had to complain of, and would transmit them over to his Majesty for a speedy redress."†

There were hopes that, when both Houses met on the 16th of November, they would be able to induce the Lords Justices to agree to a longer Session, in order to give Parliament time to discuss the very dangerous state in which the country was, and to take effective steps to apply a remedy, but those hopes were not destined to be realized. On the meeting of Parliament both Houses drew up a "Protestation," in which they declared that "their detestation and abhorrence of the disloyal rebellious proceedings and abominable actions of the persons ill-affected to the peace and tranquillity of the Realm, who, contrary to their duty and loyalty to his Majesty, and against the laws of God, and the fundamental laws of the Realm, have traitorously and rebelliously raised arms, and seized upon some of his Majesty's forts and castles, and dispossessed many of his faithful subjects of their houses, lands and goods, and have slain many of them, and committed other cruel and inhuman outrages and acts of hostility within this Realm; and that they shall and will, to their uttermost power, maintain the

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 222.

† Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 223.

rights of his Majesty's crown and Government of this Realm, and the peace and safety thereof, as well against the persons aforesaid, their abettors and adherents, as also against all foreign princes, potentates, and other persons and attempts whatsoever; and in case the persons aforesaid do not repent of their actions, and lay down arms, and become humble suitors to his Majesty for grace and mercy, in such convenient time and in such manner and form as by his Majesty, or the Chief Governors and Council of this Realm shall be set down, they further protest and declare that they will take up arms, and with their lives and fortunes, suppress them and their attempts, in such a way, as by the authority of the Parliament of this Kingdom, with his Majesty's, or the Chief Governors' approbation, shall be thought most effectual.*

The drawing up of this Protestation and the discussion upon it could not be concluded in one day, so the Houses sat a second day, to the great uneasiness of the Lords Justices. "Thus," says the Earl of Castlehaven, "both Houses of Parliament (the true representatives of the Nation's loyalty) unanimously declared their readiness to prosecute and suppress the rebels; and in order to bring them speedily to condign punishment, having with all possible zeal and alacrity offered their lives and fortunes to the Lords Justices, they fell immediately to consider of the most effectual means to do the work. But this way of proceeding did not, it seems, square with the Lords Justices' designs, who were often heard to say *that the more were in rebellion, the more lands should be forfeited to them*; and therefore, in the very heat of the business, they resolved upon a prorogation; which the Parliament understanding, the Lord Viscount Costelloe and myself were sent from the Lords' House, and others from the Commons, to the Lords Justices, to desire the continuation of the Parliament, at least till the Rebels (then few in number) were reduced. But our address was slighted, and the Parliament the next day prorogued, to the great surprise of both Houses, and the general dislike of all honest and knowing men."†

Parliament having been prorogued, the Peers and members of the Lower House retired to their residences in the country. In fact, they were obliged to do so, for the Lords Justices had already issued a Proclamation that all persons not having

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 224. *Obs.*—It was by design and not by accident the words "Rebel" and "Rebels" were excluded from the above Protestation. The Parliament thought the phrases, "disloyal, rebellious proceedings," and "traitorously and rebelliously," were strong enough.

† The Earl of Castlehaven's Memoirs, p. 28. Dublin Ed. 1815.

necessary cause of residing in the city of Dublin, and "the suburbs thereof, and the places within two miles about the same," should within four and twenty hours after the publication of the Proclamation repair to their respective homes and dwellings under pain of death.* What dreadful conditions to impose upon loyal subjects who had no security for their lives but to remain in the capital. The arms given to them for their protection against the insurgents had been taken back; the members of Parliament and many others had to hasten to their country houses, where they had no means of defending themselves, and where the insurgents visited them and exacted contributions from them that in the circumstances they dared not refuse. Yet, their intercourse with the insurgents, which they could not possibly avoid, was, in the eyes of the law, High Treason, and later on, was used against them as matter of accusation. But the reason given for commanding the peers and gentry to retire to their country houses is the most astounding part of the business: it was done, the Proclamation says, because "the Country is deprived of defence and left open to the rapine and depredation of the rebels, now in arms in this Kingdom; the poor of those parts are destitute of succour and relief, and divers other inconveniences do and may thence arise, unless some timely remedy be applied thereunto."† Alas! how hard was the fate of loyal men under the rule of those wicked Lords Justices, who first deprived them of arms and then sent them to defend the country!

The Earl of Castlehaven retired to his country house at Maddenstown, but had not been there long when he received a letter signed by the Viscounts Gormanston and Netterville, and by the Barons Slane, Louth, and Dunsany, with an enclosed one to the Lords Justices, "which," says the Earl, "these noblemen desired me to send, and, if possible, to get their Lordships' answer. The letter was very humble and submissive, desiring only they should have permission to send their petitions into England, to represent their grievances to the King; wherefore I sent it enclosed to the Lords Justices, who were silent as to theirs, yet answered mine, though little more than a cover; in which they said these were rebels and traitors, and advised me to receive no more letters from them. I readily submitted, nor do I know to this hour how that letter came to my hands."‡

* Borlase, p. 49.

† Ibid.

‡ Castlehaven's Memoirs, p. 30. The letter to Castlehaven is given in full in Carte, vol. 1, p. 297. It opens thus:—"Understanding of a Proclamation

"All this while," continues the Earl, "parties were sent out by the Lords Justices and Council from Dublin, and most garrisons throughout the Kingdom, to kill and destroy the rebels; but the officers and soldiers took little or no care to distinguish between rebels and subjects, and killed in many places, promiscuously, men, women, and children; which procedure not only exasperated the rebels, and induced them to commit the like cruelties upon the English, but frightened the nobility and gentry about, who, seeing the harmless country people, without respect to age or sex, thus barbarously murdered, and themselves openly threatened as favourers of the rebellion, for paying the contribution* they could not possibly refuse, resolved to stand upon their guard."

Sir Charles Coote, the elder, a soldier of fortune, heartless and bloodthirsty to the last degree, had become the trusted agent of the Lords Justices. In his youth he fought in the wars against O'Neill, and managed to seize lands in Connaught which brought him some £4,000 a year. He hated the native Irish most intensely, and for several reasons: 1. Because they were Irish; 2. because they were Catholics; and 3. because he had robbed them. He hated the Palesmen too, because they were Catholics and true to the King, he being a puritan, disloyal at heart like the Lords Justices, and the willing tool of the rebellious English Parliament. Towards the end of November, 1641, he was sent to Wicklow to relieve the Castle there, which was occupied by Government troops and besieged by the insurgents. In this he succeeded, but did not content himself with success; for he proceeded to inflict untold cruelties on the inhabitants of the town of Wicklow, who had no hand whatever in besieging the Castle, and had not been guilty of any other act of rebellion. It was here that one of his soldiers carried a poor babe about writhing on the point of his pike, whereupon Coote is said to have exclaimed: "*I like such frolics.*"

The route of the Government troops at Julianstown Bridge on the 29th of November, struck terror into the Lords Justices and their adherents. They hastily recalled Coote from Wicklow, and made him governor of Dublin. The news of the Julianstown disaster, spreading rapidly abroad, secured confidence for the insurgents, and swelled their ranks to such a degree that their forces lying about Drogheda, and between that town and Dublin were shortly afterwards computed at 20,000 men. The Lords of the

(which we could never come to the sight of)," &c. The Lords Justices while pretending to publish the King's Proclamation, took every means in their power to prevent it from coming into the hands of those for whom it was intended.

* The contribution exacted by the rebels.

Pale, disarmed by the Lords Justices, and left utterly unprotected by them, saw themselves at the mercy of the insurgents. They remained very quietly and in much trepidation in their houses, to which the Lords Justices had commanded them to retire after the two-days' session of Parliament. On the 3rd of December most of them received letters from the Lords Justices, calling on them to appear at the Castle of Dublin on the 8th, as they wished to consult them on the dangerous state of the Kingdom, in order to take measures for its safety.*

At this summons several of the noblemen of the Pale took alarm, especially those bordering on the parts of the country held by the insurgents, who had made visits to them, refreshed themselves in their houses, and levied contributions from them; because such intercourse (although impossible to be prevented by the Palesmen) was held to be criminal, and exposed them to the penalties of High Treason. And indeed this invitation might well rouse the suspicions of the Lords of the Pale, inasmuch as it was well known that the Lords Justices regarded them with jealousy and suspicion. Moreover, a short fortnight had only elapsed since they had rejected the advice of those very peers, when joined with that of others, and stamped with the authority of parliament. But above all, how full of suspicion was it not, to invite to Dublin persons whom they had commanded, a few days before, under penalty of death, to retire to their country houses within twenty-four hours? Three peers only obeyed the

* The summonses were all of the same tenor. The following is the one sent the Earl of Kildare:—

"After our hearty commendations to your Lordship, for as much as we have present occasion to confer with you, concerning the present state of the Kingdom, and the safety thereof in these times of danger: We pray and require your Lordship to be with us here on the eighth day of this month, at which time others of the peers are also to be here; and *this to no other end*; we bid your lordship very heartily farewell. From his Majesty's Castle of Dublin, the third day of December, 1641. Your loving friends, William Parsons, John Borlase, Ormonde Ossory, Ant. Midensis, R. Dillon, Ad. Loftus, G. Shirley, J. Temple, Rob. Meredith.

"To our very good Lord,
George Earl of Kildare."

The value of the promise made in this document by the Lords Justices may be judged by their treatment of Mr. Patrick Barnwall, of Kilbrew, one of the most considerable gentlemen of the Pale; he was a venerable old man of the age of sixty-six years, a peaceable man, and highly respected throughout the country. "This gentleman," says Carte, "having surrendered himself to the Earl of Ormonde, and received a safe-conduct from Sir William Parsons, was, nevertheless, upon his arrival in Dublin, imprisoned and put to the rack; and he, Lord Dunsany, and Sir John Netterville, suffered great hardships afterwards from the rigour of the Lords Justices, in their confinement in the Castle of Dublin for twelve or fourteen months; and being refused to be bailed, were ready to perish for want of relief."—*Carte's Ormonde*, vol. 1. The italics are mine, because the passage contains a promise of protection. J. O'R.

summons. They were the Earl of Kildare, Viscount Fitzwilliam, and the Baron of Howth. Nothing was done, the Lords Justices having put off the conference. It is no groundless suspicion makes me think that the three noblemen who attended were not those who were wanted. Had the others put in an appearance, it is more than likely they would not have been sent away from Dublin Castle with such alacrity as they had been a fortnight before. But they wisely stood on their guard. "Thus," says Mr. Carte, "the fears and jealousies of these noblemen, upon occasion of this summons drove them into such extremities as despair of mercy is wont to produce, in those who have transgressed the strict bounds of duty, and know their lives and estates, without it, to be forfeited to the rigour of the law."

The interview between the Palesmen and the insurgent leaders took place at the hill of Crofty, near Duleek, about the time the summons from Dublin Castle called the Lords of the Pale to a conference, as above stated. The battle at Julianstown occurred on the 29th November. The summonses to the Lords of the Pale are dated the 3rd of December, and were *immediately* sent out, according to Temple, who was a member of the Privy Council that had prepared and despatched them. Edward Dowdall, a gentleman of the Pale, in his sworn Relation before Sir Robert Meredith, Chancellor of the Exchequer, "deposeth that some four or five days after the defeat of the English soldiers at Julianstown, there issued a warrant from the Lord of Gormanstown to the Sheriff of the County for a general meeting of all the county at Dulick, but the place of meeting was afterwards changed to the hill of Crofty, where all the lords and gentry of the county met."* From a comparison of the above dates, it seems reasonable to conclude that it was *on receipt* of the summons to attend at Dublin Castle, Lord Gormanston got the county called together to confer on the perilous position in which they found themselves placed.

Mr. Dowdall gives the names of the leading Palesmen who attended the meeting, he himself being one; but there was besides a great multitude, which he estimates at about a thousand persons. After the meeting had lasted two or three hours, the chief leaders of the insurgents came towards the Palesmen; but of their meeting and conference, I shall speak later on. Mr. Dowdall says nothing of what transpired on the hill before the coming of the insurgent chiefs, but from what occurred later, there can be no doubt that two resolutions were come to.—1st, That the Lords of the Pale should not go to Dublin; and 2, That their reasons for not so doing should be drawn up and

* Temple, pp. 147-148. 4to Ed.

forwarded to the Lords Justices. The usual course on such occasions is, that some one person is appointed to prepare at least the rough draught of the document, and on this occasion, as was natural, Lord Gormanston seems to have been appointed to discharge that important duty. This appears from the fact that at the meeting held some days later on the hill of Tara, Lord Gormanston produced an answer, ready drawn, to the summons of the Lords Justices, which after having been read and carefully considered, was signed by the Lords of the Pale there present.*

In this answer to the Lords Justices, so appropriately agreed to and signed on the historic hill of Tara, the Lords of the Pale, having acknowledged the receipt of the summons, proceed thus:—"We give your Lordships to understand, that we have heretofore presented ourselves before your Lordships, and freely offered our advice and furtherance towards the particulars aforesaid, which was by you neglected, which gave us cause to conceive that our loyalty was suspected. We give your Lordships further to understand that we have received certain advertisements that Sir Charles Coote, Knight, at the Council Board, hath uttered some speeches tending to a purpose and resolution to execute upon those of our religion a General Massacre, by which we are all deterred to wait on your Lordships, not having any security for our safety from those threatened evils, or the safety of our lives; but do rather think it fit to stand upon our best guard until we hear from your Lordships how we shall be secured from these perils. Nevertheless, we all protest that we are and will continue both faithful advisers, and resolute furtherers of His Majesty's service, concerning the present state of the kingdom, and the safety thereof, to our best abilities, and so with the said tender of our humble service, we remain, &c.†

But to return to the Hill of Crofty. After the Lords of the Pale had been two or three hours on the hill, Colonel Mahon,

* "The work of that day was first to make answer to a summons made by the State for the calling of the Lords unto Dublin, which answer was brought ready drawn by the Lord of Gormanstown, and presented by his Lordship, and being perused by the said Council at Law [Messrs. Plunket and Birford] was signed by the Lords." *Edward Dowdall's Relation*. Temple, p. 149.

† The signatories to the above are, Fingal, Gormanstown, Slaine, Dunsany, Netterville, Oliver, Lowth, and Trimblestown. The document is addressed "to the Right Honourable our very good Lords, the Lords Justices and Council of Ireland, Dublin." It is dated December 7th, but marked Received 11th, 1641. Temple, pp. 151-2. 4th Ed. The Lords Justices immediately published a Proclamation in answer to the above letter, in which they say "They never heard Sir Charles Coote or any other utter at the Board or elsewhere, any speeches tending to a purpose or resolution to execute upon those of their profession, or upon any other a general massacre or any massacre at all."—Temple, p. 152.

Philip O'Reilly, Hugh Boy-O'Reilly, Roger O'Moore, Hugh Brine [O'Byrne] and Captain Fox, attended by a guard of musketeers, appeared approaching them. On seeing them the Lords and Gentry of the Pale rode towards them, and when within speaking distance, Lord Gormanston demanded, why and for what reason they came armed into the Pale. Roger O'Moore replied that the cause of their coming there, and of their having taken up arms "was for the freedom and liberty of their consciences, the maintenance of his Majesty's prerogative, in which they understood he was abridged, and the making the subjects in this kingdom as free as those in England were. Whereupon, the said Lord of Gormanstown desired to understand from them truly and faithfully, whether those were not pretences, and not the true grounds indeed of their so doing; and likewise whether they had not some other private ends of their own; which being by all denied; upon profession of their sincerity, his Lordship, the Lord of Gormanstown, then told them: Seeing these be your true ends we will likewise join therein; unto which course all agreed. And hereupon it was publicly and generally declared, that whosoever should deny to joyn with them, or refuse to assist them therein, they would account him as an enemy, and to the utmost of their power, labour his destruction."* "In this manner," writes Temple, "was this great transaction most solemnly consummated betwixt Leinster and Ulster. . . . The Lord Viscount Gormanstown on the one side, and Roger Moore on the other, had both been long tampering about the drawing of this most important work to the form it now received."†

The above passage from Temple is most groundless and misleading. Roger O'Moore and the Insurgent leaders were, no doubt, anxious to secure the Palesmen as allies, but the Palesmen themselves had no desire to make common cause with the Old Irish, from whom they always wished to keep at a respectful distance, except when driven to join them by some pressing emergency. Such an emergency had now arisen. The Irish leaders, and above all, that wise and able adviser, O'Moore, saw that it had arisen, and that the time was opportune for making advances to the Lords of the Pale. They seized the opportunity and made their advances. What could the Lords of the Pale do? They were most true to their king and to their religion. The Lords Justices, who represented unfortunate Charles in Ireland, were traitors to him, and hated Catholicity with

* Edward Dowdall's Relation in Temple, pp. 148-9.

† Ibid., p. 149. See also "The Irish Confederation and War. By Richard Billings," Vol. I., p. 36. Dublin, 1882.

inconceivable intensity. Furthermore, they longed to possess themselves of the rich, broad acres of the Pale. The Palesmen were pressed on the other side by the Insurgents, now grown formidable by their numbers, and on account of the prestige they had acquired by the defeat of the Government troops at Julianstown. The Lords Justices were dead against the Palesmen on every point. The Insurgents were with them, at least, in defence of their religion; nor were they disloyal, if the King, even at the last moment, would fulfil to them his repeated and solemn engagements. In this dilemma a choice must be made. And the Lords of the Pale had no alternative but to make common cause with the Insurgents. They took that alternative; but let it not be supposed they took it without a severe mental struggle. Hear the views of Protestant historians, who have written upon the matter, from an English rather than from an Irish stand-point.

"This union was never hearty," says Carte; "they differed in their views and measures during the whole course of the troubles, and the old animosity between them broke out, and shewed itself almost as soon as the union was made."* And again, "The Lords of the Pale were, even after their joining with the Irish, so little satisfied with them, and so far from desiring to increase their power, that they employed agents in these counties [i.e. Kildare and Westmeath] which had newly taken up arms, to keep them from putting themselves under the command of Roger Moore, or any of the old Irish, and to prevail with them to acknowledge the Lord Gormanston for their General."† Again, Warner writes:—"The arbitrary power exercised by the Lords Justices on every side; their illegal exercise of it in bringing people to the rack, to draw confessions from them; their sending out many parties from Dublin and other garrisons, to kill and destroy the Rebels, in which, care was seldom taken to distinguish, and men, women, and children were promiscuously slain; but above all, the martial law executed by Sir C. Coote; and the burning of the Pale for seventeen miles in length and twenty-five in breadth, by the Earl of Ormonde; these measures not only exasperated the Rebels, and induced them to commit the like or greater cruelties upon the English, but they terrified the nobility and gentry from all thoughts of submission, and convinced them that there was no room to hope for pardon, nor any means of safety left them but the sword. Tho' the Lords of the Pale had

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 256.

† Ibid., p. 262.

put themselves into arms, and made a formal declaration of their conjunction with the Ulster Rebels, yet, this union was far from being hearty, and was scarcely more than in name.”*

But if anything were wanting to show the spirit in which Temple wrote his account of the Rising of 1641, it is found in an incident which occurred on the eve of the battle of Julianstown. We have already seen that about 600 troops were sent from Dublin to the relief of Drogheda, under the command of Sir Patrick Weymiss, or Weems, as his name is sometimes written. We have seen, too, that the trusted leader of the Palesmen at Crofty, at Tarah, everywhere, was Lord Gormanston. On the evening before the defeat at Julianstown (one short week before the Palesmen met the Irish on the hill of Crofty), this Lord Gormanston sent a message to Sir P. Weymiss, warning him that there were 2,000 foot and 500 horse belonging to the Insurgent army awaiting him in ambush at Julianstown. On this intelligence, Weymiss is said to have sent forward scouts, who, as they asserted, returned without having seen an enemy. Weymiss and his 600 suffered a crushing defeat, which he would have avoided, had he, like a vigilant commander, taken proper precautions on receipt of Lord Gormanston's friendly warning.† No man had a better opportunity than Temple of knowing that Weymiss received Lord Gormanston's message; yet, with an audacity that calls for a much severer epithet, he writes in his history, that “The Lord Viscount Gormanstown on the one side, and Roger Moore on the other, had both been *long tampering* about the drawing of this important work [the agreement of Crofty hill] to the form it now received; they had at length brought it unto perfection; they two had the glory of it, and appeared the great public instruments of this powerful union.”‡ What a reliable and *truthful* Privy Council that must have been of which Temple was a leading member!

* Warner's Irish Rebellion and Civil War, p. 181. It was by the orders of the Lords Justices that Ormonde burned and laid waste the Pale, which he did very effectively, and it would seem with a ready will, although not with the severity of Coote.

† “They [Wemyss's troops] passed by Gormanstowne, but at seaven of the clocke in the morning on the 29th [Nov., 1641], where the major [Roper ?] who went in to visit the Lord of Gormanstowne, was advertised by him of the Ulster men's being in his way to stopp his passadge. But the young man soe much either sleighted this and other intelligence of this kind given him, or contemned the enemy, that he did not soe much as impart it to his officers, and causing only three scouts to be sent before, continued his march.” *History of the Irish Confederation and the War in Ireland, 1641-1643. By Richard Billings, Dublin, 1882. Vol. I., p. 33.*

‡ Temple's Irish Rebellion, 4to Ed. p. 149.

At this time the persecuting and cruel sport of the Lords Justices was shown in a very striking manner. Soon after the indiscriminate slaughter at Swords and Clontarf, their Lordships (on the 31st of January) sent Ormonde on a burning and slaughtering expedition, south-west, as far as Naas. He rested the first night at Newcastle, seven miles from Dublin, and burned it down the next morning; he also sent out parties who burned Castlemartin and Kilcullen Bridge, with several other villages round about. His next halt was at Lyons, and after burning it, he pursued his journey to Naas. This he gave up to plunder: and for two principal reasons—1, because it was said to be very “forward” in harbouring rebels; and 2, because the soldiers’ pay was in arrear, and he wished to quiet their murmuring. He did not burn the town, but placed a garrison in it, as it was a good strategic position, only one full day’s march from Dublin. Having carried out his orders, he arrived back on the 3rd of February. The city prisons were now so full that the Lords Justices made up their mind that it was, in mild phrase, necessary *to thin them*. There were three classes of prisoners: first, estated gentlemen; secondly, Catholic priests; and thirdly, laymen without property. To save trouble, and to give Coote an opportunity of practising his favourite pastime, untrammelled by Juries, or legal process of any kind, the executions deemed necessary for the thinning of the prisons, were carried out under martial law. By this arrangement the gentlemen of property escaped, at least for the moment, and for an excellent and substantial reason. For in order that their estates should become escheated to the King, on their condemnation, proceedings should be taken by *legal attainders*. Executions by martial law, therefore, fell upon the remaining two classes of prisoners, but, says Carte, “particularly upon the Romish priests, who were all in general charged as the chief excitors of the Rebellion, and whose execution would exasperate the Irish to the highest degree.”* There happened upon this occasion an event which gave the Earl of Ormonde a good deal of concern, and which he considered (as it was probably meant) to imply an indignity to himself.†

“There was one Father Higgins, a Franciscan, a very quiet, inoffensive, pious man, much respected by those who knew him,

* Of course the Lords Justices wished to exasperate them.

† How could he think so? He who had just done their work in a most “thorough” manner from Dublin to Naas. The Puritan Lords Justices wanted no other motive for hanging a priest than that he was one.

who officiated as a Roman Catholic priest at the Naas, and in the neighbourhood. He had distinguished himself in saving the English in those parts from slaughter, and had relieved several that had been stripped and robbed. The Earl of Ormonde had found him at the Naas, took him under his protection (he having never been concerned in any act of rebellion, nor guilty of any crime, nor liable to any objection, but the matter of his religion) and brought him along with him to Dublin. About six weeks afterwards, when upon the Earl of Ormonde's return from his expedition to Drogheda, it was thought politic to discourage the submissions which the gentry of the Pale, and others who had been drawn in or forced to submit to the prevailing force of the rebels, were generally disposed to make, and to exasperate them by new cruelties; and when these executions by martial law were carrying on in Dublin, whereof Sir Charles Coote was still governor (the Lords Justices having, in his favour, declined executing the order sent for putting Sir S. Harcourt into that post) this man was seized on March 24, and without any formality or delay, immediately hanged.* Ormonde, on learning of the execution of Father Higgins, expostulated with the Lords Justices in Council. "He said Coote should be tried for the act, and he furthermore threatened to throw up his Commission unless satisfaction were given him. No such thing was given him. Neither did he throw up his Commission, for which his biographer and apologist gives various reasons, and makes various excuses."†

Of Ormonde's expedition northwards above referred to, it is necessary to say something before we pass on. Since the arrival of the troops from England, the number of soldiers in and about Dublin was very large. It was considered that a sufficient part of them could be placed under Ormonde's command to march to Drogheda and raise the siege, or to help in raising it. Besides, provisions were not very plentiful near the city, and to prevent a scarcity, it was deemed prudent, and even necessary, to employ a portion of the troops at a distance from it. But there was still another, and to the minds of the Lords Justices a more important reason for sending Ormonde northwards, which was to give him an opportunity of burning and wasting the Pale in that direction, and thus so incense the Palesmen as to compel them to remain in rebellion, instead of making their submissions, as they were known to be anxious to do, and as many had done already. On the 3rd of March, 1642, Ormonde received orders

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 278-9.

† Ibid.

to lead an army of 3,000 foot and 500 horse into the Pale, and to proceed towards the Boyne, but not to cross it. His orders were plain enough, and as savage and bloody as they could be made. Here they are: "By the Lords Justices and Council, it is resolved, that it is fit that his Lordship do endeavour with his Majestie's said forces to wound, kill, slay, and destroy by all ways and means he may, all the said rebels and their adherents and relievers, and burn, spoile, waste, consume, destroy and demolish all the places, towns and houses where the said rebels are, or have been relieved and harboured, and all the corne and bay there, and *kill and destroy all the men there inhabiting able to bear armes*. Given at his Majestie's Castle of Dublin, 23 Februarii, 1641 (2)."*

In pursuance of the above orders, Ormonde left Dublin with his army on the 5th of March. He was not to commence the work cut out for him until he was five miles from the city, but as soon as that limit was passed, he sent detachments in various directions, who burned villages, wasted the country, and plundered with great security, as they met with no enemy to offer resistance. The chief cause of this non-resistance was the anxiety of the Palesmen to lay down their arms, and make their submission under protection of the King's proclamation.

In that Proclamation his Majesty says:—"We do hereby strictly command and charge all those persons, who have so presumed to rise in arms against us and our Royal Authority..... that they immediately lay down their arms, and forbear all further acts of hostility; *wherein if they fail*, we do let them know, that we have authorized our Justices of Ireland and others, our chief governor and governors, and General or Lieutenant General of our army there; and do hereby accordingly require and authorize them, and every of them, to prosecute the said rebels and traitors with fire and sword," &c.*

From this, nothing can be plainer than if those in arms laid them down their arms, and made submission, they would not be prosecuted as traitors. So the Proclamation was understood by the Palesmen, so it was understood by Ormonde, and on faith of it, a large number came to him during his expedition towards the Boyne.

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. III., p. 61. It is not unworthy of note that this Proclamation is dated *three days earlier* than the receipt of the King's Proclamation by the Lords Justices. Although the latter is dated from Westminster, 1st January, it is marked as received on February 26. Thus, if necessary, the Lords Justices could plead that their Proclamation was issued three days before the King's came to hand.

See the Proclamation entire in Carte, Vol. III., p. 53.

About fifteen of the chief Palesmen offered their submission ; amongst them were the Lords Dunsany, Netterville, and Slane, Sir Andrew Aylmer, and Sir John Netterville. By far the greater number of those who submitted were *never in arms at all*, and some of them had been even plundered by the insurgents. The case of Lord Dunsany was one of special hardship. He retired out of the Pale altogether when Lord Gormanston and the rest joined the Irish, employing his time in doing acts of kindness to the English who were in distress ; and this he sometimes did at the risk of his life. He, together with his son, proceeded to Dublin on the 19th of March, carrying with him a copy of the King's Proclamation, and surrendered himself to the Lords Justices. Those excellent gentlemen were profoundly alarmed at those submissions, feeling that if they were permitted to go on, their darling expectation of rich forfeitures in the Pale would come to nought ; so they, with laudable prudence, determined to *put an effectual stop to them*. A number of Palesmen were at once indicted for High Treason. Their crime was that they were seen conversing with rebels, whom, in their unprotected condition they could not possibly avoid, nor treat with incivility, except at the risk of their lives, the rebels being at the time, masters of the Country. Bills amounting to several hundred were found against them by pliant juries, in a couple of days, which the Lords Justices determined to have tried in due course of law, *as a terror to others*.

But they felt it necessary to explain and justify their proceedings to the Court and Parliament of England ; so they sent an elaborately prepared letter on the subject to Lord Leicester, the Lord Deputy, who, during his supposed government of Ireland, never set foot in it, and knew nothing of it except through the Lords Justices, who governed in his place, and kept up a correspondence with him. In their letter they urge three principal considerations—1. They inform the Lord Deputy that some of the chief men had made submissions, but that in all former rebellions England had been too indulgent to Irish rebels, and granted them pardon too readily ; whereas if previous governors had improved the occasions which arose in rebellions, they might have made a full reformation in that Kingdom, that would have prevented the present one, a rebellion greater and more dangerous than any of the former, in its origin as well as in the hatred which the rebels manifested to the British nation. 2. They urged the dreadful nature of the objects sought to be attained by the present rebellion, which they said was no less than the wresting from his Majesty's hands his Royal Sceptre and Sovereignty in Ireland, and the destroying and rooting out of

“all the British and Protestants, and every species of English out of the Kingdom; to suppress for ever God’s truth and true religion there, and instead thereof to set up the idolatries of the Church of Rome, and finally to pour in forces into England to disturb the blessed peace which, by the mercy of God, that Kingdom then enjoyed.”* 3. They further said that if the rebels were allowed to wipe out their crimes by submissions, they would be emboldened to make similar attempts whenever an opportunity presented itself, by which “the English would be discouraged from coming over to settle there, and the few British yet left undestroyed would remove thence, and so the settlement of religion and civility there, would be prevented; and the natives, continuing without the mixture of English, would be unserviceable either to the King or themselves, having no trades among them, being generally idle, and for the most part barbarous; and upon considering these particulars, *they hoped his Majesty would have the glory of perfecting the great work which his father had begun, and make the like settlement and reformation all over the Kingdom as King James had done in Ulster.*”†

Such Palesmen as had submitted to Ormonde he sent to Dublin before him; others, like Lord Dunsany and his son, proceeded direct to the Lords Justices, who, being wise in their generation, knew that nothing would so much deter the Palesmen from coming in, as to treat with severity those who had already done so. Hence they refused to see the Lords and Gentlemen who had come in; committed them close prisoners to Dublin Castle, and at once made preparations for their trial; the Lords Justices also took care to have it made known, that they would be prosecuted with the utmost rigour. But a serious difficulty arose with regard to the prosecutions: the prisoners had never appeared in the field,—had never committed any overt act of rebellion, and there was, therefore, an absence of sufficient facts wherewith to charge them, and, of course, an absence of witnesses, as people could not testify to things which had not happened. But the Lords Justices were equal to the difficulty, and in the absence of free witnesses against the prisoners, they had recourse to that barbarous, detestable, and even then illegal expedient, the rack, to extort evidence against them. “The two points which the Lords Justices aimed at in their examination of persons on the rack, were:—1. to force from them some confession which

* Letter of the Lords Justices to the Lord Lieutenant, 19 Mar., 1642.

† Ibid. There is the rub. Give us new forfeitures, especially in the Pale. It is hardly necessary to call the reader’s attention to the fact that the reasons put forward above, do not apply to the people of the Pale at all, whose submissions was the occasion of writing the letter.

might enable them to charge all the Roman Catholic gentlemen in the Kingdom, and particularly those of the Pale, with being originally concerned in the conspiracy; and 2. to find out some pretence to asperse the King with authorizing or countenancing the Rebellion.”*

The first who was put upon the rack was that Hugh M'Mahon, who was engaged in the attempt on Dublin Castle on the 23rd of October. While on the rack he was especially interrogated as to whether there had been any Commission from the King encouraging the Irish in their rebellion. “The tortured wretch,” says Carte, “had nothing to offer but hearsay to gratify them.” He said he had heard from Philip O'Reilly that the Irish Committee were to solicit the King for a Commission. It was on the 22nd of March that M'Mahon was racked. Next day, Sir John Read, a gentleman of the King's privy chamber, and hence his Majesty's sworn servant, was put to the torture, and questioned in the same way as M'Mahon. Having gone to Platin, near Drogheda, the strongest castle in those parts, to leave his wife in a place of security, he was prevailed upon by the noblemen and gentlemen of the Pale to carry their remonstrance and letters to the King, and to explain by word of mouth to his Majesty some particulars of their grievances and miserable situation. Sir John accepted the message, and made no secret about it, feeling that as one of the King's servants, he was entitled to carry him a message. So he sent to Sir W. Parsons for a pass to sail for England, in order to wait on his Majesty. The Lords Justices, in answer to his application, requested him to repair to Dublin, that they might confer with him. He obtained from Ormonde, who was still in the Pale, a convoy to Dublin. On his arrival he was, like the others, committed a prisoner to the Castle. The Lords Justices seized the letters addressed to the King, and never transmitted them. They put Sir John upon the rack, and endeavoured to draw from him such answers as would make the King responsible for the rebellion. They committed to writing just as many of his answers as they pleased, which, together with a confession wrung from him during his torture, they forwarded to London on the 23rd of April. By this piece of service they felt they had made such a favourable impression on the Puritan Parliament of England, that they thought they might ask a favour at their hands; and so on the 11th of May, without consulting the rest of the Council, they wrote a private letter to the Speaker,

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 293.

“beseeching the Commons to assist them with a *grant of some competent proportion of the rebels' lands.*”*

Soon after Sir John Read had been racked, Mr. Patrick Barnewall, of Kilbrees, in the County of Meath, was put to the same torture. He was a gentleman of position, who belonged to one of the most considerable families of the Pale; he was a man of retiring habits, much devoted to husbandry; he was old—nearly seventy years of age—and always most loyal; but he was present at the Hill of Crofty, when Lord Gormanston and the chief Palesmen met the Catholics who were already in arms, and although he does not appear to have taken any active part there, or at any time afterwards, he was racked, and as in the case of Sir John Read, his torturer endeavoured to extract from him something that would implicate the King in the Rising of the Irish Catholics. About the same time an Act was passed in the English Parliament, at the request of the Irish Lords Justices, for raising, by subscription, a million of money upon the security of two millions and a half of forfeited acres in Ireland, which were to be assigned by lot to the subscribers, and to be enjoyed by them and their heirs; as soon as it was declared, the Rebellion (as they term it) was at an end. The English Parliament, the true rebels, reserved to themselves the power of disposing of those lands and of the money given for them, thus depriving the King of his lawful rights. There was a clause in the Act declaring “that no part of the money, which should be paid in according to the said Act, was to be applied to any other purpose than to the reducing of the said rebels;” but the Parliament made no scruple of employing the chief part of it in carrying on their rebellion against their lawful Sovereign. In addition to this Act, they made, in favour of the Adventurers, what was called the *Doubling Ordinance*, by which it was decreed “that such of them [the Adventurers] as should then deposit a fourth part of what they had formerly subscribed and paid, should have so many acres of land added to what was allotted by the former Act of Parliament as should make their former proportion of acres double to what was granted by the Act; and whosoever would subscribe *de novo* should have the

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 296. They outlawed Sir John for High Treason, while absent and a prisoner in England, seized his wife and goods, and thrust herself and his children out of doors. All this was reversed by the Barons of the Exchequer in England, who said they could not see what Sir John Read's offence was, or what title the Crown had to his goods; still they were not returned, nor would the Lords Justices allow Lady Read ordinary sustenance for herself and her children.

like double proportion of land for his new subscription.”* Of the £400,000 raised by the Act there was sent to Ireland no more than £130,000 in money, and £30,000 in provisions, the remainder having been employed by the Parliament in carrying on their rebellious war against the King.

Those rackings and those confiscations, together with threats of extermination, so alarmed the Palesmen, that an effectual stop was put to their submissions, although they were very desirous to make their peace with the government, a thing most distasteful to the Lords Justices, as such a proceeding might prevent the confiscation of their lands, which would be a great disappointment to their Lordships, who regarded with wistful eyes the rich broad pastures of the Pale.*

Munster remained undisturbed by the Insurrection of October till towards the Christmas of the same year. The Wexford men were in arms soon after the Rising, and made several raids southwards, especially into the County Waterford, during November and the earlier part of December; but their incursions did not assume the dimensions or regularity of warfare; they resembled the older “hostings,” the object of which was to carry off “preys” of cattle, and to fight only when attacked. Sir William St. Leger was President of Munster at this time, but had no soldiers at his command except his own troop. He did not stir at first. The raiders, emboldened by success, at length went within gunshot of the gates of the City of Waterford, until their daring aroused the Lord President to the necessity of putting a stop to these insolent devastations. Some leading men of the county joined him with about one hundred horse, and thus reinforced he went in pursuit of the Wexford men to recover the cattle they had seized and carried off in their latest raid. In this expedition he succeeded, but used his success in such a savage manner, that he alarmed and disgusted the gentlemen who had come to his aid with their retainers. As soon as he overtook the raiders he killed about a hundred and forty of them, and took fifty prisoners, whom he brought to Waterford, where he had them tried by drum-head courtmartial, and executed off-hand. His fury was intensified by the fact that they had carried off a large number of cattle from his brother-in-law, Mr. Kingsmill, of Ballyowen. St. Leger proceeded thither, and on his arrival, killed three men who were said to have taken away some mares, the property of Mr. Kingsmill; and having learned that the greater part of the cattle had

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. 1., pp. 301-2, 363.

been driven into the district of Eliogarty, he at once pursued them. At Grange he executed four innocent labourers, at Bally O'Murraín six, and at Ballygarbet eight, and of course burned down several houses. Nothing but the most earnest entreaty induced him to spare Mr. Morris Magrath, the grandson of the famous Miler, Archbishop of Cashel, "a civil and well-bred gentleman;" although it was perfectly certain he had nothing to do with Mr. Kingsmill's cattle. But while he spared his life, he kept him a prisoner. Some apology can be made for St. Leger's conduct towards the grandson of the apostate Archbishop of Cashel, inasmuch as the son of that Archbishop became a Catholic in his father's life-time, and in all likelihood Mr. Morris Magrath was the son of that son, and also a Catholic.*

"From thence Captain Peisley, marching to Armaile, killed here seven or eight poor women, whom he found standing abroad in the streets near their own doors inoffensively; and passing over the river Ewyer early in the morning, marched to Clonoulta, where, meeting Philip Ryan, the chief farmer of the place, a very honest and able man, not at all concerned in any of the robberies, going with his plough-iron in a peaceable manner to the forge, where he used to have it mended, he, without any inquiry, either gave orders for, or connived at his being killed, as appeared by his cherishing the murderer. From thence he went to Goellynbridge, where he killed and hanged seven or eight of Dr. Gerald Fennell's tenants, honest inhabitants of the place, and burned several houses in the town; the cattle of the country people, which he met in his march, being all taken up by him, and sent in great numbers into the County Cork."†

After this triumphant slaughter, Captain Peisley returned to St. Leger, with whom he found the chief gentlemen of the district, headed by James Butler, Lord Baron of Dunboyne. They told the President that the late proceedings had driven the people into a state of mingled despair and exasperation; that they had been running about from house to house, not knowing what to do; and that they were then on the point of assembling in large numbers for their mutual protection. They further assured him "that they coveted nothing more than to serve his Majesty, and preserve the peace; and desired that he would be pleased to qualify them for it with authority and arms, in which case they would not fail to suppress the rabble, and secure the peace of the County." The President did not receive their

* See Note p. 39.

† Carte's *Ormonde*, Vol. I., pp. 284-5. This was what they called teaching the barbarous Irish English civility and religion.]

representations and offer in the manner expected; but in an hasty furious manner answered them, "that they were all rebels, and he would not trust one soul of them; but thought it more prudent to hang *the best of them*; and in this extraordinary passion he continued all the while these, and other persons of quality, their neighbours, were waiting upon him."* The deputation returned to their houses and prepared to stand upon their defence, whilst St. Leger continued his pursuit of the Wexford raiders into the County Waterford, killing many innocent people during his progress.

As soon as the junction of the Palesmen with the Irish became known in Munster, Philip O'Dwyer, on the last day of December, marched to Cashel, which he took, and in doing so exerted himself to the utmost to protect the lives and properties of the many English who were in the place; but "some of the rabble that were kinsmen and friends of Philip Ryan and others, that had been lately murdered, finding out some of the English there, killed thirteen of them, whose names are particularly mentioned. But all the rest of the English were saved by the inhabitants of the place in their houses, and had the goods which they confided to them safely restored. Dr. Samuel Pullen, Chancellor of Cashel and Dean of Clonfert, with his wife and children, was preserved by Fr. James Saul, a Jesuit. Several other Romish priests distinguished themselves on this occasion, by their endeavours to save the English; particularly Fr. Joseph Everard and Redmond English, both Franciscan Fryers, who hid some of them in their chapel, and even under the altar; which was proved by some of those preserved, at the trial of the latter at Clonmell Assizes in 1652; upon which he was acquitted, and had a privilege granted him of living in the country, the like offer being made to Fr. Joseph Everard. And soon after, the English who had been thus preserved, were, according to their desire, safely conveyed into the County of Cork, by a guard of the Irish inhabitants of Cashel; who acted with so much good faith in the affair, that several of the convoy were wounded in defending them from the violence of a rabble, that waylaid and attacked them upon the mountains in their passage."†

Richard Butler, Lord Viscount Mountgarret, was joined in the commission with the Earl of Ormonde for the Government of the County Kilkenny, and when the Earl was transferred to Dublin, Mountgarret had the sole authority over the forces raised for its security. He was now grown old, "but alarmed by the designs

* Ibid., p. 266. The Italics are Carte's.

† Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., pp 266-7.

which (it was confidently said and generally believed) had been formed against the Lords of the Pale, and for extirpating the Roman Catholic religion, and the professors of it out of the Nation, he resolved to take arms, and embark himself and his family in the cause. Most of the gentlemen of the county were some way or other related to him, and being generally Roman Catholics, like himself, they readily joined with him, and attended him with a numerous train of followers, to the City of Kilkenny, into which he was admitted, and there declared the reasons of his taking possession of it, and entering into arms. By public Proclamation he strictly enjoined all his followers not to pillage or hurt any of the English inhabitants either in body or goods; and succeeded so far in his design for their preservation, that there was not the least act of bloodshed committed.”*

Munster became at once aroused in defence of life and religion; and in a few days after the atrocious murders committed by St. Leger and his subordinates, all the towns and forts in the three counties of Kilkenny, Waterford, and Tipperary, were in the hands of the Irish.

III. Connaught rose last, affrighted by the slaughters it had heard of, stirred, like Munster, by the example of the Pale, and determined to assert its right to live and to practise in security that religion which its people held dear, and which their ancestors had received from the Apostle of Ireland. It is worth while to give here the view the Lords Justices took of the defection of the Palesmen and their junction with the Irish. On the 14th of December, 1641, a few days after the meetings at Crofty and Tara, those Justices made a communication to the Lord Lieutenant, which may be regarded as of a semi-private nature, as it was not signed by all the Lords of the Irish Council, but only by those who shared the sentiments of the Lords Justices, or were their creatures. In that document they, in the most pointed manner, undervalue, and almost sneer at the defection of the Lords of the Pale. They say:—“The despatch now sent you from this Board shows you in what degree of defection seven of the Lords of the Pale stand; which may, perhaps, make the Rebels the more considerable in the estimation of those that know not those Lords. We confess, indeed, it may seem to add some reputation to them; but we, who know those Lords, and the power they are able to make, and their abilities in the conduct of important affairs, do well know that it adds no more

* Ibid., p. 267. Some of the rabble endeavoured to plunder both Catholics and protestants; and Mountgarret seeing one person, a certain Richard Cantwell, who was in the rank of a gentleman, disobeying his orders in this respect, shot him dead with his pistol.

strength, in truth, to the Rebels than what they had before. For all the tenants and followers of those Lords that could be seduced were, before, either declared for the rebels or secretly joined with them; so as the strength gained to the rebels by the defection of those Lords, is now, in truth, no more than the addition of those seven men to their number.”*

No one at all conversant with the events of this period, or with the current of Irish history for a long series of years previous to it, can fail to see that the defection of the Pale was a fact of the gravest kind. The Pale was always regarded as the English garrison in Ireland, and its action in the present instance was nothing short of the revolt of a portion of England against England herself. The Lords Justices knew this as well as anybody, and the contempt they express for the Lords of the Pale was merely feigned in order to have them regarded in England as of no importance to the Irish Government, and further to insinuate that, having become rebels, they ought to be deprived of their possessions. They had no power and could be robbed with impunity! But the event proved far otherwise; for their adhesion to the national cause not only stirred Munster and Connaught, but gave new heart to all Ireland.

The savagery of St. Leger in Munster was continued in Connaught, although by other hands, and in a somewhat different manner. Sir Roger Jones, Viscount Ranelagh, was governor of Connaught at this time, with the exception of the County of Galway; the Earl of Clanrickarde, on account of his great local influence, and of his well-known loyalty, having been appointed its governor by the King's desire.

Mayo rose in arms first; the people of Leitrim, smarting from their recent confiscations soon followed, and then came Roscommon. The Castle of Galway was garrisoned by two companies of soldiers, under Captain Willoughby, a young imperious officer, who quarrelled with the people of the city—a people not at all disposed to brook insult. He imprisoned some of them, and placed guards over their ships and merchandize in the harbour. They had supplied the fort with provisions *on credit* for four or five months, but stung by this treatment, they refused to give any more except for *ready money*, a commodity not at all very plentiful with the garrison. After sometime, Clanrickarde, by his tact and influence, patched up the quarrel between them, but it soon broke out again more violently than ever, and on the second occasion the townspeople besieged the fort. Clanrickarde, in this difficulty, got some seven hundred

* Carte, Vol. I., p. 260.

foot and two hundred horse together, but feared to attack the besiegers, as they were strongly placed in rocky ground, where his horse could not act. Ultimately he had a parley with the besiegers, and made peace with them, having obtained very favourable terms. This peace he despatched to the Lords Justices for ratification; but instead of ratifying it, and thanking him for his great services in saving Galway for the Crown, in doing which he, in fact, saved all Connaught, they sent him word that they would not listen to any cessation or treaty with the rebels, that they absolutely disliked his lordship's having received the submission, and his having granted his protection to the town of Galway. They sent him an express command to receive no more submissions from any person, and ordered him to prosecute the rebels and all their adherents, "harbourers and relievers," with fire and sword. To prevent the like submissions and protections in other places they issued a general order to the commanders of all garrisons "not to presume to hold any correspondence, treaty, intelligence, or intercourse with any of the Irish and papists dwelling or residing in any place near or about their garrisons, or to give protection, immunity or dispensation from spoil, burning, or other prosecution of war to any of them; but to prosecute all such rebels, harbourers, or relievers of rebels, from place to place, with fire and sword, according to former commands, and proclamations in that behalf." Such was the constant tenor of their orders, though they knew that the soldiers, in executing them, murdered all persons promiscuously, *not sparing* (as they tell the Commissioners for Irish affairs) *the women, and sometimes not the children.**

Having at p. 130 brought the military portion of the Rising of 1641, down to the landing of Owen Roe O'Neill, we returned to the history of events in Munster and Connaught, to the government of the Lords Justices, and some other proceedings during the same periods. This second portion of our task being now done, we shall proceed with our narrative from the landing of O'Neill.

* Carte, Vol. I., p. 323. Order of May 28, 1642. C. 125, and Letter of June 7, 1642.

CHAPTER XII.

MORE than two months before the landing of Owen Roe O'Neill, the Most Rev. Hugh O'Reilly, Primate of all Ireland, summoned the members of the ecclesiastical province of Armagh to meet him in Synod at Kells, in the County of Meath, for the purpose of deliberating upon the perilous condition of the country, and upon the best means of protecting the interests of religion within it. They met on the 22nd of March, 1642, and after the solemn preliminaries usually observed on such occasions, they proceeded to deal with the grave matters for which they had been assembled. They agreed to thirteen propositions or decrees, which, in substance, were as follow :—

I. A fast for three days to be observed throughout the whole province, to be followed by Confession and Communion. II., III., IV. Excommunication decreed against all homicides and plunderers, their aiders and abettors, and against those who entered illegally on lands, or who would aid Puritans or other enemies of King or country. V. The losses of ecclesiastics and laymen, the want of respect for the clergy, the exhaustion of the country, the impediments to agriculture, the insubordination of soldiers, the caprices of their commanders, and other circumstances tending towards anarchy, indicated, they believed, the necessity for a Council with authority to rule and govern. As this should be no longer delayed, a Council was to be at once established, constituted of proper persons, both ecclesiastics and laymen, who were to swear to maintain concord, to severely correct offences, and to enforce obedience to such Council and its decrees. VI. At this juncture, they continued, when unanimity is essential, some are found uncomformable, especially Thomas Dease,* Bishop of Meath. He is charged with using his influence and authority to deter some of the chief nobles of his diocese from joining the league of the Catholics. Though summoned to this meeting he had not appeared, nor sent any representative. He is now formally admonished to desist from his courses, to revoke all his words and deeds in opposition to the present war

* Dr Thomas Dease was the owner of Turbotstown, which was then as it still is the family residence of the Deases. He died in Galway in 1654, being then over eighty years of age.

and the pious efforts of the nobles of Ireland, to sign the decrees of the present Council, to ask pardon for his absence, and within three weeks to submit himself under pain of incurring suspicion of heresy, and of being canonically reported against to the Holy See. Redmond Simon, of the Order of St. Bernard, was despatched by the Council to Bishop Dease, who was to be suspended from his office if he did not comply with their injunctions within the period above named.* VII. Catholics engaged in the present war not to be disturbed in ecclesiastical possessions, such as tithe lands. VIII. To remove abuses, correspondence was to be maintained between ecclesiastics and nobles, and arrangements were to be made suitable for the Kingdom and the army, by co-operation of the ordinaries of the dioceses, with the colonels and chief nobles, in matters connected with ecclesiastical properties. IX. All ordinaries, parish priests, abbots, and priors, are, within six weeks, to contribute according to their means to the maintenance of the army. X. In churches where mass was not hitherto celebrated, parish priests are authorized to officiate with portable altars, as they have hitherto done on hills, in woods, and in private houses, till the country shall enjoy peace and better days. XI. As the members of the present Council have to depart to distant districts, they commit to the Archbishop of Armagh authority to interpret their decrees and the course of proceeding under them, especially in relation to Thomas, Bishop of Meath. Cases of excommunication arising under the third decree are committed to the ordinaries and their deputies. XII. In every regiment there shall be at least two chaplains, to administer the sacraments to the soldiers, to instruct them, and deter them from practising extortion or other vices; each regiment, moreover, is to have a special preacher, to preach frequently to the soldiers. XIII. Authenticated copies of these decrees are to be received as of the same authority as the originals. These decrees are to be promulgated verbatim by all ordinaries and parish priests, on the first opportunity, under pain of suspension and other ecclesiastical censures.†

In pursuance of the propositions unanimously adopted by the Synod of Kells, a very important and influential meeting or "congregation," was held in Kilkenny in May. Acts to the number of twenty-nine were drawn up and signed by this congregation, of which the following is a summary:—

* It is further said of him in the above decree:—"Palam (ut fertur) dicit hoc Bellum sine fundamento esse, et injustam."

† The ecclesiastical province of Armagh was fully represented at the Synod of Kells, George Plunket, Archdeacon of Meath, acting in place of Bishop Dease, who remained away.

1. The congregation declares that the war then being carried on by the Catholics of Ireland, "for the defence of the Catholic religion, for maintaining the rights and prerogatives of the King and Queen, and for the safety and health of their royal issue, for the rights and liberties of Ireland, and for the defence of their own lives, fortunes, lands and possessions, is openly Catholic, lawful, and just." 2. Letters and Proclamations published in the King's name are not to be accepted as authentic, until it is known that "they truly proceeded from the King, left to his own freedom." 3. An oath to be framed and taken by all the Confederates, in order to secure union and concord. 4. No distinction to be made between the different races of Catholics, and no emulations to be permitted between cities or provinces. 5. Every province to have a Council consisting of persons from the counties and cities or "notable" towns. The number of such Council to be at least equal to the number of counties in the province. 6. "One General Council of the whole Kingdom" to be appointed, consisting of the clergy, nobility, cities and important towns. To this National Council the provincial Councils are to be subordinate, and, when necessary, it is to hear and decide appeals from the decisions of the provincial Councils. 7. Embassies from any one province to foreign nations to be regarded as sent from the other provinces, also the other provinces to be entitled to their portion of such aid as the said embassies may be able to obtain. 8. The eighth Act gives authority to any province which cannot send an embassy to foreign parts to empower another province to represent it. 9. The murders, burnings, and cruelties done by the Puritans to be inquired into, and vouched for by some person of "publick authoritie." 10. Every parish to have a sworn messenger to report those cruelties. 11. Persons of importance who may be taken prisoners, not to be set at liberty without the consent of all the provinces. 12. This twelfth Act deals with the transmission of prisoners from one province to another. 13. A man who is pronounced a traitor by one province, is to be regarded as a traitor by the other provinces. 14. This is a very important Act. It commands and ordains that no province, county or town shall demand peace without the consent of the General Council of the whole kingdom, under pain of excommunication *ipso facto* (!), and to give effect to this Act, it is prescribed that an oath be taken in every province, and that "a publicke and authentick instrument be made, and that such instrument be subscribed with the proper hands of such as have taken the oath," and that it be sent into the other provinces. 15. The Ordinaries, Preachers, Parish Priests and Confessors are to promote charity between

the provinces, counties, towns, &c. 16. Goods belonging to Catholics and recovered from the enemy by the war, to be restored to their former owners under certain conditions which are here laid down. 17. All who forsake the Catholic Union, fight for its enemies, accompany them to the war, defend, or in any way assist them, as by giving them "weapons, victuals, council or favour, are to be excommunicated," and by these presents, "are excommunicated, provided that this decree shall be first published in every diocese, and that the delinquents shall receive admonition beforehand, which shall supply the treble admonition otherwise requisite." "Neuters" are left to the Ordinaries under certain regulations and restrictions. 18. All who have invaded the goods of others from the beginning of the war, whether they were the goods of English or Irish Catholics, "or also of any protestant not an adversarie of this cause, and do detain such goods, shall be excommunicated, as by this present decree we do excommunicate them, if, being admonished, they do not amend." Those who keep lands or possessions against public authority, and such as "directly or indirectly hinder or forbid to pay their due rents unto such as have possessed the said lands from the beginning of the war;" and such as extort rents without the licence of such possessors, under colour of paying soldiers therewith or otherwise, fall under the same censure. 19. And churchmen, secular and regular, are forbidden on pain of excommunication *ipso facto*, to administer sacraments to such excommunicated persons. 20. Extortioners, robbers, unlawful spoilers, all thieves, those who murder, dismember or grievously strike, together with all who favour, receive, or in any way assist them, to be excommunicated, and so to remain until they "completely amend and satisfy." This decree is made retrospective, and its application and enforcement is left to the Ordinaries and Confessors. 21. Tradesmen who make weapons or powder which are brought into this country, shall be free from all taxation and customs. The same privilege is extended to all merchants who transport such wares here, as shall be profitable for the "Catholique cause." 22. Ambassadors shall be appointed to foreign courts at the next meeting of the National Congregation. 23. Ordinaries, dignitaries, and other proprietors of church livings, with the aid of the Colonel or some leading man of the county, barony, or parish, are to "set unto tenants the lands, houses, tenements, tithes and other church livings, and after competent means are provided for the said Ordinaries, &c., the remainder to be appointed for the soldiers, until it is otherwise ordained. 24. Collectors to be appointed to receive such rents. 25. Ordinaries and other proprietors of church livings may take to

themselves houses, tenements, &c., provided they pay a proportionable rent to the soldiers, when their own maintenance is sufficiently provided for. 26. Ordinaries to enter the churches to celebrate Mass therein, according as their own prudence may suggest.* 27. All priests to celebrate one Mass each week, and all laics to fast three days in one week, and one day every week afterwards, and to pray heartily to God "for the prosperous success of this our Catholic war." 28. Two confessors and one preacher to be appointed to every regiment of soldiers. 29. All noblemen, magistrates, and other "marshall commanders" are requested to promote the execution of the aforesaid statutes. Should difficulties as to the meaning of any of them arise, the Metropolitans in provinces, and the bishops in their dioceses, are to explain them.†

The acts drawn up and approved of at Kilkenny, and of which a summary is given above, were entirely the acts of the Prelates and Clergy there assembled; but the nobility and gentry then at Kilkenny, joined in forming the Oath of Association, in naming the members of the Supreme Council, of which Lord Mountgarret was chosen president, and in appointing a General Assembly of the whole Nation to meet in that city in the ensuing October,‡ which General Assembly was to be summoned

* This evidently refers to churches which had been previously in the possession of the protestants.

† History of the Confederation and War in Ireland, 1641-1643. By Sir Richard Billings, Vol. 2, p. 34. Edited by J. T. Gilbert, F.S.A., M.R.I.A. "*Hac dicta, acta, ordinata et statuta, subscripta erant nominibus sequentium Praelatorum.*"

1. Hugo [O'Reilly] Archiepiscopus Armachanus.
2. Thomas [Walsh] Archiepiscopus Casselensis.
3. Malachias [O'Queely] Archiepiscopus Tuamensis.
4. David [Rothe] Episcopus Ossoriensis.
5. Frater Boetius [MacEgan] Episcopus Elphinensis.
6. Frater Patricius [Comerford], Episcopus Waterfordensis et Lysmorensis.
7. Frater Rochus [MacGeoghegan], Episcopus Kildarensis.
8. Joannes [De Burgo], Electus Cluanfertensis.
9. Emerus [MacMahon], Electus Dunensis et Conorensis.
10. Frater Josephus Everard, Procurator Archiepiscopi Dubliniensis.
11. Doctor Johannes Creagh, Procurator Episcopi Limericensis.
12. David Bourck et Wilhelmus O'Connell, Procuratores Episcopi Imolacensis.
13. Donatus O'Tearnan, Procurator Episcopi Laonensis.
14. Doctor Dionysius Harty, Decanus Laonensis.
15. Doctor Michael Hacket, Vicar-Gener. Fernensis.
16. Gulielmus Devereux, Vicar-Gener. Fernensis.
17. Thomas Roch, Vicar-Generalis Ossoriensis.
18. Frater Lucas Archer, Abbas Sanctæ Crucis.
19. Frater Anthonius de Rosari, Ord. Præd. Vicar Provincial."

‡ Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 317.

from all the counties and corporate towns that had the right to send representatives to Parliament.

The Oath of Association was preceded by the following short preamble: "Whereas the Roman Catholics of this kingdom have been inforced to take arms for the necessary defence and preservation, as well of their religion plotted, and by many foul practices endeavoured to be quite suppressed by the Puritan Faction, as likewise their lives, estates and liberties; as also for the defence and safeguard of His Majesty's Regal Power, just Prerogatives, Honor, State and Rights invaded upon; and for that it is requisite that there should be an unanimous consent, and real union between all the Catholics of this realm to maintain the premises, and strengthen them against their adversaries, it is thought fit by them, that they and whosoever shall adhere unto their party, as a Confederate, should for the better assistance of their adhering fidelity and constancy to the Public Cause, take the ensuing oath."

THE OATH OF ASSOCIATION: "I, A.B., do profess, swear and protest before God and his Saints and his Angels, that I will, during my life, bear true faith and allegiance to my Sovereign Lord Charles, by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, and to his heirs and lawful successors; and that I will, to my power, during my life, defend, uphold, maintain all his and their just prerogatives, estates and rights; the power and privilege of the parliament of this realm, the fundamental laws of Ireland, the free exercise of the Roman Catholic faith and religion throughout this land, and the lives, just liberties, possessions, estates and rights of all those that have taken, or shall take this oath, and perform the contents thereof; and that I will obey and ratify all the orders and decrees made and to be made by the Supreme Council of the Confederate Catholics of this kingdom, concerning the said public cause; and that I will not seek, directly or indirectly, any pardon or protection for any act done or to be done, touching this general cause, without the consent of the major part of the said Council; and that I will not, directly or indirectly, do any act or acts, that shall prejudice the said cause, but will, to the hazard of my life and estate, assist, prosecute, and maintain the same. Moreover, I do further swear, that I will not accept of or submit to any peace made, or to be made with the said Confederate Catholics, without the consent and approbation of the General Assembly of the said Confederate Catholics. And for the preservation and strengthening of the Association and union of the kingdom, that upon any peace or accommodations to be made or concluded with the said Confederate Catholics as aforesaid, I will, to the utmost of

my power, insist upon and maintain the ensuing propositions, until a peace, as aforesaid, be made, and the matters to be agreed upon in the articles of 'peace, be established and secured by Parliament. So help me God, and his Holy Gospel."

The propositions above referred to, claim : 1. For the Catholics—Clergy and Laity—the free and public exercise of their religion, as it existed in the reign of Henry the Seventh, or any other of the Catholic Kings. 2. That the secular clergy of Ireland of all degrees, shall possess the same jurisdictions, privileges and immunities as they enjoyed in the reign of King Henry the Seventh, and in as full and ample a manner. 3. That all laws and statutes enacted against the Catholics for the exercise of their religion, since the twentieth year of King Henry the Eighth's reign, shall be declared void by Act of Parliament. 4. That the secular clergy of every degree, and according to their rank, as well as their respective successors, shall have and hold all the churches and church livings in as full and ample a manner as the protestant clergy enjoyed the same on the 1st day of October, 1641, together with all the profits, emoluments, &c., belonging to them.

The oath of Association, the second paragraph excepted, was declared binding, and enjoined to be taken by "all sorts of people," by the General Assembly of Confederate Catholics held at Kilkenny, on the 24th October, 1642.*

Thus, we see the Government established at Kilkenny in October, 1642, consisted of two great divisions, the General Assembly and the Supreme Council. The former was to all intents and purposes a parliament, without the actual name. The Peers and Commons met in the same chamber. The "seats were built to the height of three ascents. Those at the upper end were designed for the Lords and Prelates, not so particularly as [that] others of the trustees did not frequently sit there with them. The chair of the Prolocutor was placed at the side of the room, somewhat nearer that end. The precedence of speaking, as to other members of the House, was determined by the Prolocutor: but a nobleman or prelate that offered to speak, was always preferred. All applications to the Prolocutor were made by his proper name; for although they endeavoured their assemblies after the model of the most orderly meetings, yet they avoided, so far as was possible for them, all circumstances that might make it be thought they

* Borlase, pp. 127, 128. 336 of the first men in the kingdom signed the roll of the Confederation. See list of names in Billings' *History of the Confederation and War*. Vol. II., p. 212.

had usurped a power of convening a Parliament, the calling and dissolving whereof the Supreme Council by their Petition sent to the King, after the adjournment of this Assembly, avowed to be a pre-eminence inseparable from the Imperial Crown."*

The Supreme Council, as we have seen, was chosen by the General Assembly, and the greatest exactness and care were exercised in the selection of its members from all the Provinces. Lord Viscount Mountgarret was made President; and Sir Richard Billings, Secretary. There were Provincial Councils chosen to hear and determinate provincial affairs, but from these there was always an appeal to the Supreme Council, which body may be styled the executive department of the Government. It had the power of summoning the General Assembly, when it was considered necessary to do so. After the Confederation Government was permanently settled, the members of the General Assembly who did not belong to the Supreme Council retired to their homes.

The Supreme Council had an official seal made, which consisted of a central cross, a crown to the right, a harp to the left; a dove above the cross, emitting brilliant rays, and beneath the foot of the cross a flaming heart. The whole was surrounded by the legend, "*Pro Deo Rege et Patria Hiberni unanimes.*"† The first important documents that passed under this seal were commissions appointing four generals—one for each province.

Colonel Thomas Preston was appointed General for Leinster. As his name implies, he belonged to one of the leading families of the English Pale, being uncle to Viscount Gormanston. He was educated in Flanders. Being a Catholic, and therefore having no hope of suitable employment at home, he sought fame and fortune in foreign fields. He took service under the Spanish Crown, and fought in many campaigns, especially in the Low Countries, where he earned much renown by his defence of Genep. (*Preachers v. Soldiers*, lxxiii.)

Don Eugenio O'Neill (*Owen Roe*), the General chosen for Ulster, is so well known to fame that I need not say anything of him here.

* Billings' History of the Irish Confederation, &c., Vol. I., pp. 111-12.

† By order of the General Assembly this Seal was made under the direction of Billings. Two engravings of the Seal are given in Mr. Gilbert's Ed. of Billings' History of the Confederation, Vol. I., p. 84, one taken from an impression in the Archives of the Irish Franciscans, the other from an engraving, dated Rome, A.D. 1662. In the former the words "*Hibernia unanimes*," are used; in the latter, "*Hiberni unanimes.*"

Major Garret Barry was made General for Munster, Lord Muskerry giving up his claims to the appointment for sake of unanimity. Barry had also served in the Spanish wars. He had, says Billings, "such a temper of abilities and parts as moved excellently by direction, but irregularly when they were the balance upon which their own motion depended." (Vol. I., p. 74). At the time of his appointment as General of Munster, he was old and seems to have been feeble. When Lord Inchiquin was carrying everything before him for the English, in that province, the Southerners appealed to the Confederation to send them a new General, inasmuch as that their present General (Barry) "was old and unfortunate." Castlehaven was sent to them, who marched against Vavasour, a commander under Inchiquin. Barry and Castlehaven were to have joined their forces at a certain point before they would attack Vavasour, who was much their superior in numbers; "but," writes Castlehaven, "the old General moved so slowly that I had the enemy defeated before he came within two miles of the place."*

Colonel John Bourke was appointed to Connaught with the power of General, but only bearing the title of Lieut.-General. This was done to keep the post of General vacant for Clanrickard, who the Confederates hoped would join them. Bourke, like the rest, learned the military art in foreign wars. The Author of the *Aphorismical Discovery* calls him "a brave warrior . . . reputed in foreign countries a very expert soldier."† He, with other officers, was sent to Ireland by Urban VIII. He stated in his letter to Cardinal Barberini that having served 38 years under the Crown of Spain, he desired to end his days at home, in the war which his countrymen had undertaken for the liberties of Ireland.‡

The whole success of the war depended on those four appointments, and as far as the military experience of the Generals was concerned, no one could find fault with them; but the fatal omission in the case was the non-appointment of a General-in-Chief, as without such a head there could be no combined action for any length of time. Probably the Supreme Council saw this clearly enough, but the known rivalry and jealousy which existed between O'Neill and Preston made it impossible to place one over the other, without the immediate resignation

* Castlehaven's Memoirs, p. 58.

† Vol. I., p. 50.

‡ Billings, Vol. II., xciii. Preface.

of the General passed over. Carte says, Preston hated O'Neill, and O'Neill despised Preston. As to Barry and Bourke, neither of them could be thought of for the post of Commander-in-Chief.

The time was opportune for the Irish Catholics to assert their right to the free and public exercise of their religion, and to such political concessions as they had a just claim to. The Palemen had made common cause with the old Irish; the Prelates and other dignitaries, who had remained quiescent or nearly so during the campaign of Sir Phelim O'Neill, now came forward and testified in the most distinct and formal manner their adhesion to the movement, declaring that it had right and justice on its side. This declaration, like many others that went before it, combined loyalty to the King, with the determination to fight the battle of their religion. The O'Neill party may, indeed, have had some secret aspirations after their old position in Ulster, should circumstances favour them, but in the great body of the nation the prevailing idea was to vindicate their right to freedom of worship, not so much imperilled by the King himself, as by the Puritan faction which governed for him, misrepresented him and betrayed him in Ireland.

The relations which at this time existed between the King and his rebellious Parliament made the fear of effective opposition from that quarter far less than it would have otherwise been. Notwithstanding his many shortcomings, Charles was much to be pitied at this juncture. He visited Scotland, the cradle of his race, where the name and blood of Stewart would, in other days, have evoked enthusiasm enough to build an impregnable bulwark around him. But all was changed now. Before he left England, however, he had been informed that the first outburst of Puritan frenzy had abated in Scotland, and that a reaction had set in there, in the minds of the more moderate and better informed people. Montrose and his friends assured Charles, that by confirming his former concessions, and by the liberal distribution of honours and offices at the close of the Session of Parliament, then sitting, he could have a victory over the Covenanting leaders. He did his best. He, apparently, at least, took an interest in their religion; he appointed one Henderson to be his chaplain;* permitted himself with rare patience to be bored almost to death by the

* Henderson, a minister of Edinburgh, was by much the wisest and gravest of them all, but as all his performances, that I have seen, fall flat and heavy, so he found it was an easier thing to raise a flame than to quench it. Burnet's History of his own time, Vol. I., p. 44. 12mo Ed.

interminable sermons of their ministers, and assiduously attended the services of the Kirk. He raised the Puritans to the chief offices, and made their General, Leslie, an Earl—Earl of Leven. But all this failed to win or satisfy them. No; nothing he could do, nothing he could bestow, could ever counterbalance their fanatical hatred of popery, prelacy, and royalty.

Charles, on his return, no longer felt himself free from danger in London; he was certainly not free from insult. He quietly withdrew from the capital to York. This proceeding freed him from the control of the two Houses, and instead of insults from snobs, he received dutiful addresses from loyal subjects. The Parliament had voted a levy of sixteen thousand men against the King's wishes, and raised money by forced loans. He, on his part, was not idle. He received a supply of arms from the Queen, who had, some time previously, gone to Holland, and he was presented with supplies of money from many of the noblemen and clergy, as also from the universities. The civil war was inevitable. The King summoned all his loving subjects on the same day north of the Trent, and twenty miles south of it, to meet him at Nottingham on the 22nd of August, 1642, where he raised his standard, which bore a crown with the legend "Give Cæsar his due."

In Ireland the Confederate generals began to show activity. The Supreme Council decreed that thirty thousand troops should be raised for Leinster, the greater number of them being intended for garrison duty in the various forts. Six thousand foot and six hundred horse were to compose Preston's army for active service. When about one half of these were got together, he took the field. The passages from Westmeath to Kilkenny, as also those from the north and Connaught were dangerous, but the way by Leix was entirely blocked on account of the number of castles held by the English on that route. To reduce these strong places was the first service undertaken by Preston. His first enterprise was to attack the castle of Borris-in-Ossory, which was surrendered to him on quarter. Thence he marched to Birr, then held by the son of the notorious Coote. He sat down before it, got some guns into position, and began to work at his mines, but the place was given up to him in five days, "upon quarter of lives and swords." He next summoned Castlestewart, the governor, to surrender fort Falkland to him, situate in M'Coghlan's Country, and anciently called Benchore. It was a strong place with a numerous garrison, but its defenders were depressed for want of supplies, which were often promised, but never sent by the government. Its garrison was aware, too, that Preston had

granted an honourable capitulation to Birr, and as they had no hope of relief, Castlestewart surrendered the fort to Preston, on condition that he and all his people should be safely conveyed to Galway—a stipulation which was honourably fulfilled by Preston, for he sent them with a guard of two companies.* Preston took several smaller places during this expedition.

Although Charlemont Fort was a strong place in O'Neill's days, and long afterwards, his position there, when he took possession of it, was one of great peril. He had followers, but no army. Many flocked to his standard attracted by his name, his great reputation as a general, as also for sake of the sacred cause he had come to fight for. But he had no army properly so-called, whilst General Leslie (lately made Earl of Leven) was at the head of twenty thousand foot soldiers and a thousand horse, one half of which were his own countrymen, the other the King's English troops. O'Neill expected to be besieged by Leslie, so he worked night and day strengthening his fortifications and drilling his soldiers. Leslie, like O'Neill, was a soldier of fortune, and had attained to high command abroad. He once met O'Neill in the field and got so badly beaten by him, that he ever afterwards entertained so great a fear of him, that it amounted to timidity, if not cowardice. Perhaps it was this which kept him at a respectable distance from Charlemont Fort. On O'Neill's arrival, Leslie wrote him a letter expressing his concern that a man of his reputation should come to Ireland for the maintenance of so bad a cause as the one he was engaged in. Owen replied that he had better reasons to come to the relief of his country than his Lordship could plead for marching into England against his King. He further calls on him to quit the Kingdom of Ireland, to defend Scotland, his native country, and not to be accessory to the spilling of the innocent blood of such as never yet annoyed him. "If you be not so advised," wrote O'Neill, "I will use my utmost endeavours against you, and do confide in God Almighty, who knows the justice of my cause and the injustice of yours. As he gave me the victory over you one day in Germany, as you should remember, so his same Providence will be pleased to make me an instrument of lessening you by your head, fit payment of your unjust war upon this nation."† "Leven found by this answer, that he was not a match for O'Neill in letters; and whether or no, he concluded thence that

* Warner, pp. 241-2. When they reached the confines of Connaught, General Bourke, in command there, sent the greater number back to Athlone, only permitting Castlestewart and his immediate retinue to pass.

† Aphorismal Discovery, Vol. I., Preface xxvii. See also Leland and Warner.

he was not a match for him in arms, it is certain that in the short stay he made in Tyrone he attempted nothing ; but retreating back to the northern part of the province, he delivered up the command of the army to Monroe, and telling him he would certainly be worsted, if once O'Neill got an army together, he went off for Scotland.*

About three months after O'Neill's arrival in Ireland, he went to Kilkenny, had interviews with the principal men, took the oath to the Confederation, and was appointed their general for Ulster.

Before the cessation of hostilities, active operations in Munster were not very numerous on the side of the Confederate general. Inchiquin, however, was not idle, and success attended most of his undertakings. Barry, besides his slowness, which was partly natural, partly the result of age, was so accustomed to regular warfare abroad, with trained soldiers, siege guns, a good commissariat, everything, in fact, to his hand, that he could not adapt himself to the rough and ready make-shift kind of warfare which he was appointed to carry out in Ireland. About the time Vavasour arrived with one thousand foot from England, Barry took up a position at a place called Richardstown, about a mile from Cork city, then held ostensibly for the King. Barry had three thousand ill-armed foot, and about fifty horse. Whatever ideas he might have entertained of taking Cork with such a force were dissipated by the arrival of Vavasour and his thousand foot, and some much needed supplies. The Irish, however, kept their position to prevent the garrison from making excursions into the country to requisition provisions and to seize castles. The President of Munster, Sir William St. Leger, was sick, and Lord Inchiquin was appointed to command the army in his place.† He engaged Barry's beleaguering forces with inferior numbers, and after some hard fighting routed the Irish, chiefly

* Warner, p. 227. LESLIE: "A still more distinguished man than Charles Leslie was Alexander Leslie, a soldier of fortune, who, bursting through the trammels of illegitimate birth, and a scanty education (he could write his name but nothing more) rose to be a field marshal of Sweden, under the great Gustavus Adolphus. He was recalled to Scotland in 1639, to take the command of the Covenanting army ; and in 1641 was made Earl of Leven, and Lord Balgony." *Chambers's Encyclopædia*. Art. *Earls of Leven*.

† This Lord Inchiquin was by name Morrogh O'Brien, and familiarly known as Morrogh *an toth-aine*—"Morrogh the Incendiary ;" "an epithet," says the author of the Historical Memoir of the O'Briens, "applied not in a figurative sense, as it is occasionally at present, but literally, this leader making as much use of fire as of the sword in his operations among his countrymen." He was the grandson of that Baron Inchiquin who perished at the Erne in 1597, fighting for Elizabeth against Red Hugh O'Donnell. He learned the art of war in the service of Spain, and returning to Ireland in 1639, was appointed Vice-President of Munster, under Sir William St. Leger, whose daughter he had married, and whom he accompanied in his expeditions against the Catholics. Feeling that

on account of his superiority in horse, the Irish being very weak in that respect. The country was now open to Inchiquin. He soon reduced all the neighbouring castles except Blarney; he marched to the Lord President's house at Doneraile, and to Mr. Jephson's at Mallow, both garrisoned places; and by taking some troops from each he strengthened his forces. He now felt himself master of the field, and moved about without fear of molestation; but he soon encountered an enemy as formidable as unexpected—far more formidable than Barry had proved to be. "For," writes Billings, "whilst he was thus employed, Sir William Ogle and Sir John Paulet arrived with their regiments of foot, each of them consisting of a thousand men, whom the Lord Inchiquin caused to march immediately, and with them made divers incursions into the county of Limerick and other places, preying the country within his reach, to the great loss of the inhabitants, and no small harm to the English soldiers, who, having fed too greedily on the fresh meat they daily killed, fell so generally sick of fevers and fluxes, that of two thousand six hundred men, in two months' time there were but six hundred found to bear arms."*

Lieutenant-General Bourke who commanded in Connaught was a native of Mayo, and had many relations and connections both in that county and Galway. He had the reputation, and no doubt justly, of being a zealous Catholic and a lover of his country. This made many of those who had previously sided with Clanrickard to desert him and join General Bourke; the clergy, too, began to take an active part with the Confederate cause, led and encouraged by the Bishop of Clonfert.† Bourke

he had been slighted by the King in not being made President of Munster on St. Leger's death, he deserted his cause and went over to the Parliamentarians, from whom, in time, he also seceded, and rejoined the Royalists at much risk and sacrifice. At the Restoration he expected to be made President of Munster, an office he had long coveted; "nor," says Borlase "could anything have hindered him of it since his Majesty's happy return.....but his change of religion." He had been, or like so many others, pretended to be a protestant for the greater part of his life in Ireland, but gave public proof of his Catholicity for a considerable time before his death. It is to this circumstance Borlase refers. By his last will he bequeathed £20 to the Franciscan friars of Ennis, and £20 "for the performance of the usual duties of the Roman Catholic clergy, as also for other pious uses." See Archdall's *Lodge*, Vol. II., p. 55, and O'Donohoe's *Historical Memoir of the O'Briens*, p. 265, *et seq.*.

* "The Irish Confederation and War," by Sir Richard Billings, Vol. I., p. 77.

† This Bishop of Clonfert was the Rt. Rev. John Bourke, a full namesake of the Lieut-General, although no relation of his, the Bishop being a scion of the House of Clanrickard, as appears from the following:—"Promovendus ex legitimo matrimonio, nobilibus et Catholicis parentibus (ex Comitibus Claricardian. *Propoganda*), ortus est in eadem diocesi." He was translated to Tuam in 1647. Brady's *Episcopal Succession*, Vol. 2, p. 215.

took many of the strong places in Mayo and Galway, but the most important military undertaking he had in hand before the cessation was the siege of the Fort of Galway. It was held by Captain Willoughby for the Government, but his reckless conduct was unaccountable; for whilst it was certain that no relief could be expected from any quarter to raise the siege, Willoughby wasted his ammunition by continually firing on the town, and used his provisions with as much prodigality as if his means of supply were limitless, whereas he deprived himself of his only source of supply by exasperating the towns-people against him. Clanrickard, a smooth politic man like Ormonde, vainly endeavoured to make peace between the Fort and the town. He frequently called upon the Lords Justices to remove Willoughby from his command and appoint another; but they would not do so. Their conduct in the matter can be only explained by the fact that they knew Clanrickard was for the King, and that he was a Catholic besides. Clanrickard seeing the Fort must yield, endeavoured to have it given up to himself, but the Lieut.-General, ignoring this piece of management, came to terms with Willoughby, and was handed over the Fort for the Supreme Council, which soon after had it demolished. With the Fort of Galway Lord Clanrickard's Castle of Oranmore, situated on the bay $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles east of Galway, was also surrendered.*

As soon as the Irish Confederation was organized they appealed to the Catholic nations for countenance and support. Urban the VIII. was Pope, and they approached him through Father Luke Wadding, then Rector of the College of St. Isidore, whom they had appointed their representative in Rome. Father Wadding was most favourably received by His Holiness, who sent the Pontifical blessing to the Irish, and also remitted them a considerable sum of money. They despatched two delegates to the Emperor Ferdinand the Third, and the Duke of Bavaria. They reminded the Emperor that there were many reasons why the Irish should have recourse to him, as head of the House of Austria. Under him and his father, they said, all the honours and riches in the Austrian dominions had been opened to the Irish, with unbounded munificence, and the soldiers of the Irish race in the service of Austria had been always noted for their fidelity. And now, in their struggle for religion, country, and justice, the Supreme Council begged of his Imperial Majesty to afford them his aid and countenance. Father Hugh Bourke and Father Nicholas Shee were nominated

* See Warner, pp. 256-7,

to act in Flanders for the Confederation. In November and December, 1642, letters from the Supreme Council, and credentials for their agents were despatched to the King of France, the Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin, the Prince of Liege, the nuncios in France and Flanders, the Archbishop of Mechlin, the Catholics in Holland, Count William Gall (an Irishman who had attained high position in Germany), the governors of Biscay, Dunkirk, and others. "In their communications they detailed the circumstances under which they had entered upon the war, for religion, king, and country, and appealed for assistance and contributions."*

The power and influence of the Confederation extended daily in spite of the reverses which their generals occasionally met with. The English forces in Ireland were in a deplorable condition (especially those in and near Dublin) for the commonest necessities of life. Supplies came scantily from England, and most of what did come never reached their intended destination, being shamefully malversated by the Lords Justices and their agents; so that a cessation of hostilities with the Confederation became urgently necessary both here and in England.

The heads of the army in this country drew up a representation of their grievances to be laid before the King, but the Lords Justices and the Committee of the House of Commons† did their utmost to prevent it from reaching him. However, in spite of their opposition, Major Woodhouse succeeded in getting to Oxford, where he laid the document before Charles, although it does not appear certain how he got away, as I find no account of a pass having been granted to him. He reached Oxford on the 8th of February; and there can be little doubt but Woodhouse was the bearer of private letters to Charles from Ormonde, urging the necessity of a cessation of hostilities. Certain it is that Ormonde was most anxious that Woodhouse should be allowed to proceed on his journey, and it is not unlikely that it was through his influence he was ultimately allowed to take his departure.

* Billings' History of the Irish Confederation, Vol. I., Preface lxx. See Letters in Vol. II., Appendix.

† This was a Committee of the English House of Commons, consisting of Robert Reynolds and Robert Goodwin, two of its members. They were sent to Ireland ostensibly to inquire into the state of the army and Kingdom, but really to induce the army to desert the King and go over to the Parliament. The Lords Justices allowed them not only to sit in the Privy Council, but to vote, although not Privy Councillors at all. The Marquis of Ormonde complained of this to the King, who had a stop put to it. Reynolds and Goodwin soon after returned to England.

The king's cause was not prospering in England. He had the great majority of the upper classes with him; his camp was crowded with the young nobility on the eve of the battle of Edge Hill. He felt sure of victory. Both sides fought well; both claimed the victory, but there was really no victory at either side. The cavaliers who surrounded Charles were brave and devoted, but the privations of camp life were too much for them; they were better suited to grace his court than to fight his battles. They remind us of the young Patricians who were with Pompey at Pharsalia, and at whose faces Cæsar told his veterans to strike, knowing well that "those pretty young dancers," as he called them, would rather fly than suffer their good looks to be marred with sword cuts. The loss of Reading, which surrendered to the Parliament on the 26th of the following April, much depressed Charles (although the garrison of four thousand men was allowed to march out unmolested), and must have still more inclined him to a cessation of hostilities with the Irish.

Goodwin and Reynolds, the English Parliamentary Committee, for obvious reasons, endeavoured to prevent the cessation, and they had agents constantly at work trying to obtain the signatures of officers and protestants in Dublin and its vicinity, declaring their dislike to the Commission which Ormonde had received to treat of a cessation with the Catholics. There had been several offers of a cessation from the Irish side before the present one, but they were suppressed or rejected by the Lords Justices, who had resolved on visiting with the severest punishment the Catholics who had taken up arms, and all who favoured them. The nobility and Commons who met in Kilkenny in July, 1642, drew up a petition to the king, asking his gracious permission to lay their grievances before him. The transmission of this document was delayed by the chicanery of the Lords Justices, and hence the same noblemen and gentlemen when they re-assembled in the same city in the following October, renewed the request. Meantime the first petition had been sent to his Majesty by the Marquis of Ormonde, but this was not made known to the Confederation, and hence their second petition in October.

Charles, considering that such a petition coming from so large a body of influential and loyal subjects called for all the consideration he could give it, issued a Commission under the Great Seal of England, bearing date the 11th January, 1643, to certain commissioners to treat with the Irish Catholics regarding a cessation of arms for one year. Those Commissioners were, the Marquis of Ormonde, the Earls of Clanrickard

and Roscommon, the Viscount Moore, Sir Thomas Lucas, Sir Maurice Eustace, and Thomas Bourke. It was sent by the last named to Ireland, who had been much about the King's person.* Any three of the Commissioners were to constitute a quorum.

On the 3rd of February the Commissioners sent a summons to the Supreme Council to send some of their number to treat with them—the Commissioners—about a cessation of arms; a safe-conduct having been at the same time sent for such as might be appointed. Certain conditions were laid down in the summons which gave offence to the Supreme Council: 1. The first was, that of those appointed to meet the King's Commissioners none should be ecclesiastics. 2. The second, that not more than thirty representatives should be sent by the Supreme Council. 3. The third, that they should appear "with that respect which ought to be given to such as were honoured by his Commission, by those who were in the nature of petitioners."

To this summons the Supreme Council sent a reply dated "Ross, [where they then were] 9th February, 1643." Having acknowledged the receipt of the summons the Supreme Council proceeded thus:—"To this summons are added instructions signed by the said Commissioners limiting the number and directing the quality and behaviour of such as shall go. In the first place we are not satisfied why a Commission, whereof the date is not expressed, and is mentioned to have been granted upon a petition of the Catholics of Ireland, which was sent in August last to be conveyed unto his Majesty, should so long be kept from the knowledge of the parties interested. And we believe it would be proper for us to have a view or a copy of that Commission; concerning instructions given us for the demeanour of our Agents, although this war hath produced many bad effects, yet we hope incivility has not won so much on either side, as we should stand in need of admonitions to regulate our behaviours. Together with this summons, and the addition likewise attested by the said Commissioners, we have received an instrument signed by the Lords Justices, and expressed in that addition to be a safe-conduct; in which instrument we observe, how it lies in the power of some eminent ministers of the State, either surreptitiously to procure from beyond, or unwarrantably to insert in their writings here, the words (*actors or abettors in so odious a Rebellion*), and to apply them unto the Catholics of this kingdom; we are not (praise be to God) in that

*The English Parliament in its Declaration against the Cessation says, "one Master Burk, a notorious pragmatic Irish papist, was the chief solicitor in this business."

condition to sacrifice our loyalty to the malice of any; and it would be a madness beyond expression for us, who fight in the condition of loyal subjects, to come in the repute of rebels to set down our grievances. We take God to witness, there are no limits set to the scorn and infamy flung upon us, and we will be in the esteem of loyal subjects, or die to a man.”*

This spirited answer so offended the Commissioners, that they paused in their proceedings, to consider whether they should take any further steps regarding the important matter entrusted to them. During this interval a second letter was dispatched by the Supreme Council, in which some points in the first were toned down, which was chiefly due to the Earl of Castlehaven, who having heard at his brother's house at Kilkash, (where he was then staying) of the summons and reply, hastened to Kilkenny, and induced Sir Richard Barnwall, Sir Robert Talbot, and some others to join him in appealing to the Supreme Council to write in milder terms to the Commissioners. They yielded and did so. But before this second letter reached the Commissioners, they had replied to the first, sending at the same time, a copy of the King's Commission. The second letter from the Supreme Council and the Commissioners' reply to their first, bear the same date, the 18th of February, 1643, so that they were written on the same day, and must, therefore, have crossed each other in transmission.† The Supreme Council more than suspected that the words “odious rebellion” were inserted in the safe-conduct without authority by the Lords Justices; but they must have been chagrined and disappointed at finding they were copied from the King's Commission, in which he declared “his extreme detestation of the odious rebellion, which the Recusants of Ireland had, without any ground or colour raised against his person, Crown, and dignity.” This was simply untrue, but a Stuart rarely stuck at a prevarication, or at worse things.

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. III., p. 131.

† I have followed Sir R. Billings' account in this matter of the letters, because he was Secretary to the Supreme Council at the time, so that all letters and communications to them must have come under his notice. Moreover, he was a member of the Supreme Council, and his name as one of the signatories, is to the letters they sent to the Commissioners. Carte seems to say the Commissioners replied to the first letter of the Supreme Council only *on receipt of their second*. But this is a clumsy and improbable settlement of the question. Why not answer both letters, if they had not answered at all till the second was received? Billings' account is more natural and his authority much higher than Carte's; but the context in Carte shows he was anxious to humiliate the Supreme Council and elevate the Commissioners. See Billings' *History of the Irish Confederation and War*, Vol. I., p. 122. 4to, Dublin, 1882; and Carte, Vol. I., pp. 396-7.

Charles knew as well as man could know anything, that the Catholic Peers and Commoners who met at Kilkenny, were his most loyal subjects, and truest friends; but this and phrases like this were the sops by which a weak vacillating man endeavoured to propitiate those puritan rebels, whom nothing but his blood could satisfy.

After some further correspondence, not necessary to be reproduced here, it was arranged that the agents of the Confederation should meet the King's Commissioners in Trim, on the 17th of March, in the current year, 1643.

When the Lords Justices were informed that his Majesty had issued a Commission to inquire into the grievances of the Catholics, they determined, if possible, to defeat its object. The army in and near Dublin had been, from various causes, in extreme want of supplies for a considerable time; so the Lords Justices determined to send a large part of it on some expedition in order to provide sufficient food. New Ross was then governed for the Catholics by one Nicholas Fitzharris as Sovereign, and this was the place chosen for attack by the Lords Justices. Besides sending the army in search of provisions, the Lords Justices had other strong reasons (perhaps they were the chief reasons) for sending the army to attack New Ross at this time. In the first place Ormonde was sick, and could not, they believed, lead the army; in the next place, Lord Lisle, the Lord Lieutenant's son, and a thorough Parliamentarian like his father, being commander of the horse, could be and was appointed to the chief command instead of the Marquis; and by this move it was hoped the army could be influenced by the new commander to desert the King, and transfer their allegiance to the Parliament, or rather "to the King and Parliament;" this being the phrase under which the Puritans, at this time, concealed their disloyalty.

What gives further strength to this view is, that the expedition to New Ross was concerted with the English Parliament Committee before they left Dublin, and Lord Lisle's appointment as Commander-in-Chief agreed upon.* Moreover, it was felt that if Lord Lisle won at Ross, it would show the King the weakness of the Catholics, and that there was no need of making them concessions; if he were defeated a cry could be raised that the Catholics had murdered wholesale the English who resided among them, and that no mercy should be extended to them.†

Ormonde, who had daily information of these proceedings, saw

* Carte, Vol. I., p. 399.

† Billings' Irish Confederation, Vol. I., p. 123.

through the plot, and determined to defeat it; he was now convalescent, although not quite recovered. "And now," writes Billings, "the army was in a posture to march, when the Marquis of Ormonde.....came very unexpectedly to the Council Board; and having after many feigned congratulations for his health, and seeming fear that he had exposed himself to a relapse by his so sudden coming abroad into the air, taken his seat amongst them, he let the Justices know, that having understood with what care and zeal of his Majesty's service their Lordships had furnished all befitting accommodations for an expedition against the enemy, he would not (whatever came on't) be wanting to do that part of his duty, which his honour and their good example called upon him to execute. The regard which the Lords Justices professed to have of his health was all they could allege to divert him from his enterprise, but that being argument which he told them he was ready to overcome with the hazard of his life, they gave over to press it, and retired to contrive how to cross a design, which they had been at so much expense to advance, for no other reason than it was to be managed by a person who had devoted himself inseparably to promote the King's interests; and that they missed of preferring one of their faction to conduct it."*

"The Lords Justices conceiving the readiest way to break the design would be to discontent the officers, gave private directions for stopping the monies intended for their equipage[equipment]. This, indeed, was the occasion of much murmur amongst them, yet it was so far from conducing to that end for which it was intended, that the officers, who bore a great affection to the Marquis of Ormonde, under whose command they had gained the battle of Kiltrush, and made other successful and beneficial expeditions, and whose table and purse was always open to them, rather seemed well satisfied to have found an occasion to testify their readiness to serve under his conduct, what strait soever they were driven to. Wherefore having first with a soldierly liberty inveighed against the faithlessness of the Lords Justices, who went about to defraud the officers of what was once intended for them, they repaired to the Marquis of Ormonde, and entreated him to believe that this withdrawing of the Lords Justices' benevolence, how necessary soever it might be for them, should be no impediment to their march; since he had health to lead them, they had wills to follow him upon any enterprise he would undertake without reflecting upon their condition. The Marquis of Ormonde thanked them for their so hearty expressions of their

* Billings' *Irish Confederation*, &c., Vol. I., p. 124.

loves to him, and told them that he hoped the times would be such as he might be able to render them some other proof of his gratitude than a bare acknowledgment of the affection they bore him. And seeing (said he) that we are to be fellow-fighters, it is reason there should be no distinction of purses; therefore, gentlemen (said he), while it lasts in mine, think yourselves rich, and when we are poor alike, we have good swords, a large country, and many enemies; but you are to stay here awhile, and to send for the rest of our comrades, the disappointed officers, that at least we may make our grievances known to those who are able to redress them. After all of them were gathered thither, and that the Marquis understood the Lords Justices were sat in Council, he walked in at the head of them to the Council Chamber door, and sent in word by one of the ushers that he was there, with the officers of the army, to demand audience. Answer was returned that the Lords desired he should enter and take his place among them, and as a Councillor he might hear what the officers had to say, and join in consulting what answer was fit to be given. To this he replied that he stood in the capacity of Lieutenant-General of his Majesty's army, and that he was unfit to be judge as being a party and interested in the same request. Whereupon all of them were admitted. Then he began, with great submission to the King's authority, in the presence of those whom he knew to be his enemies, first to declare the valour, fidelity, and success with which those officers served the King, and their ready obedience to his command, notwithstanding the great hardship they had suffered, and the extreme wants which they were often compelled to undergo. Then he bemoaned his own misfortune, saying it was hard the affection the officers bore him shall not only encourage them to support many inconveniences, which perhaps are not always sought to be prevented when necessity seems to impose them, but they should now for his sake, and when he is to execute his charge in the head of them, be deprived of that little which was designed for them; and concluded, seeing it was very evident his Majesty's service, his own honour, and those gentlemen's necessary supply, were highly concerned in the retrenchment he understood their Lordships were to make, it was fit he should be dispensed with to accompany the officers to fetch the money from the place where he knew it was laid up, which he had much rather do by their warrant than that of unavoidable necessity. And so, taking his leave, he retired to his own house in the same company, not executing suddenly the resolution he had taken, for he was of the mind when the Lords Justices should fall to consider how acceptable the action would be to those who had the power of

the sword, and were to use it in their own cause, they would change their opinion and suffer themselves to be led by this new way of preservation. Nor did he take his aim amiss, for the Lords Justices soon after sent to let him know, that although by giving order for making those payments they should be compelled for want of means to lay aside the thought of another design of very great consequence, yet they had, at his Lordship's request, directed moneys should be given to the officers for their equipage."*

Ormonde left Dublin on the 2nd of March, for New Ross, at the head of 2,500 infantry and 500 cavalry,† and also some pieces of ordnance. He marched with all expedition, taking Castlemartin, Kildare, and the Castle of Tully on the second day, and on the third arrived at Timolin, the old castle of which was a place of no strength, but was held by "four score stout men," who refused to surrender to Ormonde, or to give free passage to his troops. "The ordnance was planted, and the castle began to be furiously battered; the besieged in the meantime doing notable harm to the enemy, and retiring still as any part of the castle was taken, and fell to that which remained sound of it. At length the Marquis of Ormonde, seeing them reduced to the last extremities, and yet offering with an undaunted courage, to defend themselves, sent to give them quarter, which when they had accepted, and left their post and arms, they were cut in pieces by the Lord Lisle's regiment, some say by his direction, Colonel Warren, who was an officer in it, striving (but in vain) to appease the incensed soldiers."‡

Marching by way of Carlow, Ormonde arrived before Ross on the 12th of March, without being at all expected there. "A Trumpett [*un trompette*, a trumpeter, or herald] advanced to demand a parley. Mr. Nicholas Fitzharris, who, by the name of Sovereign, exercised the charge of Chief Magistrate on the town, coming to the market gate with five or six of his Aldermen,

* Billings' Irish Confederation and War, 1642-43, Vol. I., pp. 125-6-7. I give the above lengthy passage on account of the light it throws on Ormonde's character—a character difficult to understand or penetrate; because he was a great master of the art of concealing his real views and sentiments under a smooth diplomatic exterior. But there is a good deal of the real man in the way he surprised and discomfited the Lords Justices, as related above. Indeed, so intent was he on making his *coup* a complete success, that for some time previously he had carefully concealed the real state of his health, leaving it to be understood that he was not so convalescent as he really was, so that his appearance in the Council Chamber must have seemed little short of an apparition, and certainly not a pleasant one to their Lordships.

† This is Carte's account, but Billings makes Ormonde's army more numerous.

‡ Billings' Irish Confederation and War, Vol. I., pp. 127-8.

asked what he had to say. His answer was that the Earl of Ormonde, Lieutenant-General of his Majesty's army, sent him to demand the surrender of the town, and to offer fair quarter to the inhabitants. To which the Sovereign replied that they were the King's loyal subjects; that they kept the town for his Majesty, and would not capitulate for the surrender of it to the Earl of Ormonde or any other.* "Ormonde planted his guns and made a breach in the defences, which were of so little strength that they could not be called walls. The few soldiers who were in the town, strengthened by 300 men sent to their aid by Preston, under the command of Colonel Arthur Fox, and joined 'by the inhabitants of all ages and sexes,' repelled several sharp attacks made by the besiegers. Ormonde seeing that the place could not be taken in that way, desisted, and his provisions being nearly spent, he sent Colonel Stephens with his troop of four score horse to hasten the supplies from Duncannon. Stephens returned with the unwelcome news that the supplies promised by the Lords Justices had not arrived, upon which Ormonde drew off his ordnance and marched towards a place called Palemonte, four miles from Ross, where he sighted the Confederate army under the command of Preston, with whom was Mountgarret, but not apparently in any command. Both sides prepared for battle. Ormonde won, with fewer troops, it was said, than Preston commanded. By common opinion, Preston's disposition for the engagement was very faulty, so much so that one of his officers, Hugh M'Phelin, seeing, as he considered, how unskilfully Preston had placed himself, sent him word that he ought either to advance to meet the enemy or allow him to pass, and then harass him on his march."† Even Carte is very severe on Preston, for he says, "Nothing can excuse his gross error, in quitting his camp and advancing to meet an enemy whom he might have destroyed without fighting, and without hazard."‡ Indeed, so badly were the Irish troops handled that "it was given out by many understandinge witts that the posture of the Irish for battle that day could not be voide of treachery;"§ But Preston's incapacity can account for it, without accusing him of treachery, for which no substantial proof is given.

* Billings' *Irish Confederation and War*, Vol. I., p. 128.

† *Aphorismical Discovery*, Vol. I., p. 61.

‡ Carte's *Ormonde*, Vol. I., p. 406. This view of Carte's does not clash with Hugh M'Phelin's; what Carte means is that Preston should not have advanced at all; Hugh M'Phelin's view is that having advanced, he did not advance far enough, but took up an unfavourable position, while having the choice of ground.

§ *Aphor. Discovery*, Vol. I., p. 62.

Ormonde, after his victory, continued his march to Dublin.*

As the battle of Ross was fought on the 18th of March, it is needless to say that it was impossible for Ormonde to be in Trim on the 17th, the day appointed for the King's Commissioners and the Agents of the Confederation to meet at that place. Ormonde, foreseeing the possibility of this, wrote to Lord Moore by Lord Roscommon, whom he sent from the army beforehand, that if he, Ormonde, could not be at Trim on the 17th of March, Lord Moore and Sir Maurice Eustace were to meet Lord Roscommon there, "to see commission of the 11th January executed." Accordingly, on the appointed day, the Earls of Clanrickard and Roscommon, the Viscount Moore and Sir Maurice Eustace met at Trim, as the King's Commissioners, the Lord Gormanston, Sir Robert Talbot, Sir Lucas Dillon, and John Walsh, Agents for the Confederate Roman Catholics, who presented to the Commissioners a written remonstrance, setting forth their grievances under fourteen heads, and desiring the redress of them. The Remonstrance is addressed directly to the King, in these words:—

"Most Gracious Sovereign, we, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Catholics of your Highness's Kingdom of Ireland, being necessitated to take arms for the preservation of our religion, the maintenance of your Majesty's rights and prerogatives, the natural and just defence of our lives and estates, and the liberties of our country, have often, since the beginning of these troubles, attempted to present our humble complaints unto your Royal view; but we are frustrated of our hopes therein by the power and vigilance of our adversaries (the now Lords Justices and other Ministers of State in this Kingdom), who, by the assistance of the Malignant party in England, now in arms against your Royal Person, with less difficulty to attain the bad ends they proposed to themselves, of extirpating our religion and nation, have hitherto debarred us of any access to your Majesty's justice, which occasioned the effusion of much innocent blood, and other mischiefs in this your Kingdom, that

* A strange and ludicrous incident occurred after the battle was over. Whilst Ormonde was busily engaged, "the Lord Lisle and the rest of the troops possessed with a panic fear, ran away from the flying and pursued enemy; and a man might make a pleasant observation upon the capriciousness of fortune, and the different dispositions of men, that saw the Lieutenant-General and the General of the horse of the same army, the one labouring to rescue some officers of note among the discomfited enemy, who were made prisoners, from the fury of the soldier; and the other in his flight, loudly offering ten pounds for a guide to Duncannon, when the Kingdom, at that time, could not have afforded him a more secure retreat than that whereon the battle was fought." Billings, Vol. I., p. 131-2. When the panic was over Lord Lisle and the rest returned to the camp and joined in the thanksgiving for the victory.

otherwise might well be prevented. And whereas, of late, notice was sent unto us of a commission granted by your Majesty to the Right Honourable the Lord Marquis of Ormonde and others, authorising them to hear what we shall say or propound, and the same to transmit to your Majesty in writing, which your Majesty's gracious and Princely favour, we find to be accompanied with these words, *viz.*, (*albeit we do extremely detest the odious rebellion which the recusants of Ireland have, without ground or colour, raised against us, our crown and dignity*), which words, we do, in all humility, conceive to have proceeded from the misrepresentations of our adversaries, and therefore do protest we have been therein maliciously traduced to your Majesty, having never entertained any rebellious thought against your Majesty, your crown or dignity, but always have been, and ever will continue your Majesty's most faithful and loyal subjects. And do most humbly beseech your Majesty so to own and avow us; and as such we present unto your Majesty these ensuing grievances and causes of the present distempers."

The Remonstrants then proceed to state the grievances for which they seek redress from his Majesty.

1. They complain that the Catholics of Ireland, "whom no reward could invite, no persecution enforce to forsake that religion professed by them and their ancestors for about thirteen hundred years," are, since the second year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, made incapable of places of honour in Church or Commonwealth, whilst their nobles have become contemptible, and the sons of their gentry, debarred from learning in Universities or public schools, are obliged to live in ignorance and contempt at home, or seek education or fortune abroad.

2. Whilst the Catholics are thus incapacitated on account of their religion, men, for the most part of mean condition and parts, are employed in the places of greatest honour and trust, who have built up their fortunes on the ruins of the Catholic natives, and have, moreover, suggested such false and malicious matters against them, as to render them suspected and odious in England, through which conduct many mischiefs have befallen the Catholics. Witness the withholding of promised Graces, and the procuring of false inquisitions upon feigned titles of their estates; "so that of late times, by the underhand working of Sir William Parsons, Knight, now one of the Lords Justices here, and the arbitrary illegal power of the two impeached judges in Parliament, and others drawn by their advice and counsel, one hundred and fifty letters Patents were avoided [made void] in one morning; which course con-

tinued until all the Patents of the Kingdom, to a few, were by them and their associates declared void."

3. The Remonstrants remind the King that his Royal Father had sent many Commissions into Ireland, and instructions for the securing of the estates of his subjects; and that under his privy signet, those estates were secured to his subjects, and letters Patent passed, fines paid, old rents increased, and new rents reserved to the crown; and furthermore, they remind him that he himself, in the fourth year of his reign, gave favourable hearing to their grievances, granted many graces to his Irish subjects for security of their estates, and for the redress of those grievances; yet such was "the immortal hatred" of some of his ministers, and especially of Sir William Parsons and the impeached judges and their adherents, that under pretence of his Majesty's service, "the public faith involved in those grants was violated, and the grace and goodness intended by two glorious Kings successively to a faithful people, made unprofitable."

4. They complain, that the illegal and arbitrary proceedings of the said Sir William Parsons and one of the impeached judges, in the Court of Wards, caused the heirs of Catholic noblemen and other Catholics to be "destroyed in their estates," and bred in dissipation and ignorance; prevented the debts of their parents from being paid, and left their sisters and brothers wholly unprovided for; made ancient tenures valid in law, to be made void, and filled the land with "frequent swarms" of Escheators, Feodaries, Pursuivants, and other of the like kind, by authority of the said court.

5. His Majesty's attention is directed to the fact, that in spite of the heavy pressures upon them, and their many other grievances, the Catholics did, readily and without reluctance or repining, contribute to all the subsidies, loans, and other extraordinary grants made to him in Ireland since the beginning of his reign, amounting to well nigh one million of pounds over and above the regular revenue claimable from them. And although they were the most forward in granting the said sums "and did bear nine parts in ten in the payment thereof," yet such was the power of their adversaries, and their frequent opportunities of approaching his Majesty, that they obtained the reputation of getting in those moneys, and were entrusted with the distribution of them, to his Majesty's great "dis-service," whilst they represented the Catholics as obstinate and refractory.

6. It is forcibly brought before his Majesty, that the army raised at great expense in Ireland for his service, was dis-

banded by the pressing importunity of the "malignant party" in England, who alleged that the said army was popish, and therefore not to be trusted; that Sir William Parsons, Sir Adam Loftus, and others, declared an army of ten thousand Scots was to arrive in Ireland, to force the Catholics to change their religion, and that Ireland could never do well without a rebellion, in order that the natives might be entirely extirpated; and wagers were laid at General Assizes, and at public meetings, that within a year no Catholic would be left in Ireland; that the ancient and unquestionable privileges of the Parliament of Ireland were, unjustly and against law, encroached upon by the Parliament of England; and that the said Catholics were thoroughly informed of the Protestation made by both Houses of the English Parliament against Catholics; and that they had certain notice of "the bloody execution of priests there—only for being priests," and that neither his Majesty's mercy nor power could save the life of even one condemned priest; and that the Catholics of England, although being of the same flesh and blood, must suffer or leave their country. Yet these things, unjust and wicked as they were, did not prevail with the said Catholics to take up defensive, much less offensive, arms.

7. They remind the King of the Committees of the Lords and Commons of Ireland, who had some time previously waited upon him, and they thank him for the many patient audiences he gave them, during a space of nine months, which they remained in England, waiting on his Majesty; but that the Lords Justices and the malignant party crossed and frustrated his Majesty's gracious intentions towards those whom the Committees represented, and traduced, through their instruments, the Parliament of Ireland, alleging that it had no power of judicature in capital causes. And after certain knowledge "that the Committees were by the water side in England, with sundry important and beneficial bills, and other graces, to be passed as acts in that Parliament, of purpose to prevent the same the said faction, by the practice of the Lords Justices and their adherents, on the 7th of August, 1641, and on several days before, in a tumultuous and disorderly manner, cried out for an adjournment of the House; but being outvoted on the point, the Lords Justices told several Peers that if they did not adjourn on that day, being Saturday, they themselves would prorogue or adjourn the Parliament on the next Monday morning. The Lords' House was adjourned on the said 7th of August, and the House of Commons soon after; by which means, those bills and graces according to his

Majesty's intention, and the great expectation and longing desires of his people, could not then pass as Acts of Parliament."

8. The Remonstrants inform his Majesty that Sir William Parsons, Sir Adam Loftus, Sir John Clotworthy, Arthur Hill, Esq., and others, got up petitions to the House of Commons in England, containing matters destructive to the Catholics, their religion, lives and estates; and to those petitions they obtained many thousands of signatures in Ulster and other parts of the kingdom. Then the plot of destruction by an army out of Scotland, and another from the malignant party in England, aroused the well-grounded fears of the Catholics, so that some of them did, about the 22nd of October, 1641, take up arms in maintenance of their religion, his Majesty's rights and the preservation of their lives, estates and liberty. They declared themselves ready to submit their grievances to Parliament, and prayed to be heard there, but the Lords Justices slighted their declarations, and caused a Proclamation to be published on the 23rd of October, accusing *all* the Catholics of Ireland of disloyalty, and proroguing the Parliament to the 26th of February of the following year.

9. The Parliament, which had sat to the beginning of August, waiting for the Committees bearing the "Graces" from his Majesty, in order that those Graces might be at once passed into laws, was adjourned to the 9th of the following November in the manner stated in paragraph 7. Before that day arrived the Rising in Ulster took place, and the Lords Justices [as stated above] immediately published a Proclamation denouncing the Catholics as rebels, and putting off the meeting of Parliament to the 26th of February in the following year. The lawyers held it was against law to prorogue Parliament by Proclamation, and that it must meet on the day to which it was previously prorogued before there could be a new prorogation. The Lords Justices to meet this difficulty, and yet not acknowledge themselves in the wrong, allowed the Parliament to meet for one day in November—not on the 9th, but the 15th—under the proviso, that it would at once turn to the business of making a protestation against the rebels. This arrangement was, of course, made to exclude the consideration of any other question, and so prevent the Graces granted by his Majesty from becoming law. The majority of the members did not attend on the 15th of November, being apprehensive for their personal safety; and the few that met were not allowed to bring any attendants, nor to carry arms [which was the custom on such occasions], whilst "they were environed by armed men with matches lighted," as

they passed in and out, in order to terrify them into the views of the Lords Justices; and it was whispered about that the musketeers had orders to shoot those who opposed the Lords Justices as they passed out of the Parliament House. Under this terrorism their wishes were complied with.

10. The Remonstrants complain of the calumnies written to England regarding the Irish Catholics, whilst by far the greater part of them, especially those in the cities and corporate towns of the Kingdom, and whole provinces besides, remained "peaceable in their houses," in spite of which they were disarmed, whilst the Malignant party were armed by the Lords Justices, those towns and cities that always remained loyal having been refused arms, which they sought for their own protection, and at their own expense; moreover, that a proclamation was sent over from the Parliament of England, offering pardon to all who would lay down their arms, but that Sir William Parsons "so wrought with his party," that this proclamation was only published in two counties, and even in these most sparingly. The Remonstrants then bring under the King's notice the conduct of Coote in Wicklow, and of others at Clontarf, Santry, &c., as already recorded in these pages.

11. They direct his Majesty's attention to the proceedings of the Lord President of Munster, who, "by direction of the Lords Justices (that province being quiet), with his accomplices, burnt, preyed, and put to death men, women, and children, without making any difference of quality, condition, age or sex, in several parts of that province; the Catholic nobles and gentlemen there, mistrusted and threatened, and others of inferior quality trusted and furnished with arms and ammunition." The province of Connaught was used in like manner, so that the Catholics, without arms or ammunition, were compelled to look after their safety, and stand on their defence.

12. They complain that the Parliament of Ireland was deprived of its rights, having been independent "in all successions," from the time of King Henry the 2nd, so that no record or precedent could be found that any statute made in England could or did bind this Kingdom; yet, that an Act for reducing the rebels, and a further Act explaining it, were passed in the Parliament of England in the 18th year of his Majesty's reign; which Acts the Catholics do conceive to have been forced upon his Majesty; and by which his subjects, unsummoned and unheard, were declared rebels, and two millions and a half of acres, arable, meadow, and profitable pasture within this Kingdom, were sold to undertakers; the said undertakers obtaining edifices, loughs, woods, bogs, &c., gratis.

13. The Lords Justices are charged with driving loyal and peaceable subjects into rebellion. First, because all strangers and such as were not inhabitants of Dublin, were in and since November, 1641, ordered to leave the city, but had no sooner departed than they were pillaged "abroad," and their goods seized upon and confiscated in Dublin; and although, before they had appeared in any overt act whatever, they desired to place themselves under the protection of the State, they were refused that request. Secondly, because persons of rank and quality, who kept aloof from disturbances, and who were living under, and having the protection of the State, were by the directions of the Lords Justices pillaged sooner than any others; their houses having been burned, themselves, their tenants, and their servants killed and destroyed. Thirdly, because when the commanders of the army gave quarter or protection, the same was, in all cases, violated; and the cities and towns, such as Dublin, Cork, Drogheda, &c., which received garrisons in his Majesty's name, "were worse used than the Israelites were in Egypt."

14. They point out to his Majesty that the fundamental laws of Parliament were violated by the action of the Lords Justices in holding Parliaments when nine-tenths of the genuine members were absent, because it was not consistent with their personal safety to come and take their places; whilst the Lords Justices filled up a considerable number of seats in the House of Commons with clerks, soldiers, serving-men, and others not legally chosen, and who had no estate whatever within the Kingdom; and that the juries who passed judgment on the lives and estates of such as came in upon protection and public faith, were made up in the same manner.

In conclusion, the Remonstrants pray his Majesty to apply speedy and suitable remedies to their grievances, which would tend to the settlement and improvement of his revenue, and stop the further effusion of blood. They assure him that his loyal subjects [the Catholics] "in manifestation of their duty and zeal for his service, will be most willing and ready to employ ten thousand men, under the conduct of well experienced commanders, in defence of his Royal Rights and Prerogatives." They most humbly pray that he will vouchsafe gracious answers to their humble and just complaints; that he will be pleased to call a free Parliament, at such time as may seem good to his wisdom, and the present urgency of affairs requires; and that such Parliament may be called in an "indifferent place," summoned by and continued before persons of honour and fortune, of

approved faith to his Majesty, and acceptable to his people.* They further pray that Poyning's law may be suspended during the sitting of this Parliament, and that the Catholics may not be debarred from sitting in it, nor of giving therein their free vote "by any matter whereof complaint is made in this Remonstrance."

The King's Commissioners in sending him a copy of the Remonstrance, of which the above is an epitome, write as follows:—"According to your Majesty's Commission to us directed, we have received this Remonstrance, subscribed by the Lord Viscount Gormanston, Sir Lucas Dillon, Knight; Sir Robert Talbot, Baronet; and John Walsh, Esq.; authorised by, and in the behalf of the Recusants of Ireland, to present the same unto us to be transmitted to your Sacred Majesty, dated the 17th day of March, 1642-[3]." CLANRICKARD and ST. ALBANS, ROSCOMMON, MOORE, MAN, EUSTACE.

Ormonde, on his return from Ross, sent the Trim Remonstrance to the King, accompanied by a letter from himself, in which he says he had not time just then to fully express his views, adding, however, "only this I dare, with your Majesty's permission ever, that neither the propositions nor letter are, as they stand, for your service."† The King, following Ormonde's view, took exception to several points in the Remonstrance, more especially that regarding a toleration of the Catholic religion, saying, that he could not consent to an abrogation of the Penal Statutes against it, and would not undertake to grant more than his predecessors had done, which was "a connivance in the execution of them."

The proposal for a cessation of hostilities originated with the King himself (most probably at the suggestion of Ormonde), but as it was inconvenient to have it so understood, Ormonde was to manage the matter in such a way, that the cessation would appear to be a *concession* from the King to the Catholics. It had, indeed, become a pressing necessity for the Royal cause both in England and Ireland; for although in the King's formal Commission of the 23rd of April, to Ormonde, he "commands and authorizes" him to treat for a cessation for one year, on the best terms he can, he earnestly urges the matter upon him in a

* The Remonstrants here clearly indicate that they do not wish the Parliament to meet in Dublin, nor the Lords Justices to be the summoners of it.

† Carte's Ormonde, Vol. III., p. 150. The propositions mean the Remonstrance; the letter referred to is one from the Lords Justices against peace with the Rebels, and indicating the necessity of a general confiscation of their lands.

letter partly in cypher, which he wrote on the same day, and transmitted to Ormonde by Sir Patrick Weemes. In this letter he says, "As soon as that (the Cessation) is done, the Marquis of Ormonde must bring over the Irish army to Chester."*

The Confederate Catholics had spread their power and influence at home, and were receiving considerable sympathy from abroad, because they were regarded as struggling in the sacred cause of religious freedom for the Catholic Church, against a persecution of the most galling kind, inflicted by men who founded their whole justification for separating from that same Church on the right of private judgment in the choice of a religion. Besides, the English army in Ireland could not possibly keep the field much longer, for they were bootless and shoeless, and starving. There were scarcely any supplies in Dublin; the Parliament's cruisers prevented supplies from being sent from England; the army was sent to various parts of the country, not so much to fight the enemy as to look for food; but the portions of the country open to them afforded no supplies, so that the everlasting burning and destroying which was so long their chief occupation, recoiled, like a judgment, on their own heads. One fact, which partakes in no small degree of the ludicrous, will illustrate the state of destitution to which the English army in Ireland was reduced at this time. Lord Inchiquin's army in Munster was in the saddest plight. He cast about everywhere in vain for provisions for his famishing troops. He was informed from England, that the Parliament was so taken up with their own danger, that a word about Ireland would not be listened to. Once again he tried Dublin. The Lords Justices, considering his great distress, ordered six hundred barrels of salt herrings (real Dublin Bays, of course) to be shipped in the Christmas holidays (!) on board the Captain Hart, to relieve the necessities of the Munster forces. Sir Philip Percival paid the freight and other charges of the same, but before the ship sailed, the distress in the Leinster army increased so much that the Justices were forced to order it to be unladen, and the herrings to be distributed to the soldiers at Dublin, to the loss of all the charges that had been paid, and the great discontent of both armies †

In the matter of the Cessation Charles left everything to the

* LXVIII. Carte Papers, V. p. 147. Quoted in Billings' "Irish Confederation and War," Vol. II., p. 266.

† Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 424. "There remained little for the army in the dead of winter, so that they were forced before Christmas to feed on salt herrings, which were, indeed, the proper goods of the inhabitants, taken up without money." Percival's Vindication in Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 456.

prudent management of Ormonde; and he, with that diplomatic intuition which seldom deserted him, employed Clanrickard as his trusted agent in the business. No better choice, no choice half so good, could have been made.* Clanrickard was on excellent terms with all parties, without belonging to any. He was true to the King; neither Charles nor Ormonde had the least doubt of that. He never broke with the Puritan Party, although they gave him much provocation, especially in connection with his action in Galway. He was a good Catholic, most acceptable to the Confederation, which was so certain he would join it, that it only made Colonel John Bourke *Lieutenant-General* of Connaught, reserving the chief command there for Clanrickard; but it was never taken up by the accomplished diplomat, who played his part so skilfully, that he seemed like an agile performer in the circus, who manages three or four steeds at once with graceful dexterity. He did not put the question of the Cessation before the Supreme Council in any direct way at first. That might spoil the business; but "he," says Billings, "drew up in writing motives for a Cessation of arms, and dispersed them by such hands as made them sufficiently public."† The matter, of course, soon got wind and came to be earnestly discussed.

Clanrickard's quiet initiative having prepared the way, Theobald, Lord Taaffe, and Colonel John Barry next appear on the scene. Taaffe had only just returned from England, where he had several confidential interviews with Charles. Taaffe and Barry were both Catholics, and earnest supporters of the King's interests. Ormonde gave them passes to Kilkenny, where the General Assembly was to meet on the 20th of May, and their business there was to induce, if possible, that body to seek a cessation of arms. Their proposal met with many obstructions. It was well known to the Confederate Catholics that the English army in Ireland was in a state bordering on starvation, whilst they had no hope of supplies either from England or Ireland, the Catholic army being, at the same time, in a fair state of efficiency. Castlehaven and his forces had taken the chief places in Carlow and the Queen's County, Preston had advanced into Meath, and Owen O'Neill into Westmeath, where they were securing the harvest, O'Neill having already made provision for the like purpose in Cavan; and the government troops, which were sent against them, were compelled to return to Dublin without effecting anything, as they neither had food nor ammunition. Colonel Monck had to be recalled from Wicklow, and the

* The Irish Confederation and War, Vol. I., pp. 154-5.

† Ibid.

places abandoned by him were immediately occupied by Castlehaven; and Dublin itself was so stripped of troops, that Preston made incursions within two miles of it, unopposed.*

About this time Father Scarampi, of the Congregation of the Oratory, arrived from the Pope as his delegate in Ireland, bringing with him large supplies of money and ammunition for the Catholics, and letters from His Holiness to the Generals of the four provinces, to the Supreme Council, and to the Prelates.† In July, 1643, [Sir] Richard Billings addressed a statement to Father Scarampi in favour of a Cessation, which, under the existing circumstances, does not appear very cogent. 1. The first reason given by him is, that a Cessation would disprove the calumnies circulated against the Irish Catholics abroad, that they were rebels to the King. 2. It would effect the removal of the army to England, which only plundered *here*, but *there*, would be serviceable to the King. 3. It would give the Catholics time to arrange their government and affairs, unsettled by the sudden commencement of the war, and would enable them to raise money at home, and to test the sentiments entertained by Catholic Princes abroad towards "our just and pious war." 4. The Irish Catholics by combining their forces with the English, might together attack the Scots, who are enemies to both nations. 5. And lastly, that the Catholic Church might in safety and freedom, *by a tacit licence from the King*, exercise her rights and jurisdiction among us."‡ Billings very coolly adds:—"The representatives whom we have sent to negotiate for a Cessation, are to treat on a subsidy to the King without which the affair cannot be concluded."

The above epitome of Billings' reasons for a Cessation shows them to be so feeble, that they did not deserve a serious refutation; but as they were addressed to Father Scarampi, he felt bound to give them an answer, which he did in the name of the Irish Catholics. The following are the leading points of his reply:—

1. It is the custom of the English, he says, to desire those Cessations to relieve [their present necessities, and afterwards "advance their own objects," regardless of the articles agreed upon,§ and although they have an army in the field it is not so

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 447.

† Ibid.

‡ The Italics are mine. J. O'R.

§ A fact admitted by Carte a hundred years afterwards in these words:—"It had been usual for the State of Ireland in such exigencies to make temporary Cessations with the rebels to gain time for receiving supplies out of England; and these had been found by experience very serviceable to the preservation of the kingdom." Life of Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 424.

well provided as ours. In any case matters should be protracted until we receive letters from our agents, and also to give us time to secure the harvest. 2. "We do not appear to be as yet reduced to extremities, such as should cause us to sue for a Cessation with timidity, or to seek to obtain it by money." The Catholics should undoubtedly carry on their work, establish the authority of their Parliament, and the security of their country "by arms and intrepidity, not by Cessations and indolence." 3. The struggle between the King and his English Parliament must soon come to an end by the triumph of either party. Whatever party triumph, it will be to our advantage, that the successful one shall "find us in arms, well provided, with increased territories, and stronger in foreign succour:" thus we shall not be "so easily invaded and swallowed up." 4. "Our resources do not enable us to send an army to the King's aid in England." A war with the Scots would be long, difficult and perilous. The money asked from us would, it is believed, be converted by the King's ministers, our enemies, to their own use, or perhaps even used against us; properly expended, it would maintain our army in the field for nearly a half a year, should it be necessary to do so. 5. We have received succours in supplies of arms from foreign princes almost unsolicited, given through "pure zeal for religion, to promote the exercise of the Catholic faith in Ireland; and it would be unbecoming in us, and perhaps offensive to them, to make a Cessation without consulting them." 6. The Delegate is of opinion that he would be recalled if a Cessation were made, especially if concluded without consulting the Pope. "The real object of his mission was, he averred, to reinstate the Catholic religion and worship throughout the whole country, and to restore to the entire island the splendour of its ancient sanctity, without infringing upon the loyalty due to the king."*

The Cessation came at last after much opposition and delay. The State of the King's affairs in England made it a necessity, and for that reason it was promoted by Ormonde, but neither Ormonde nor Charles relished the demand put forward by the Catholics in connection with it. It was not, perhaps, so much the concessions themselves that they feared, as the mortal offence which conceding them would be sure to give the Puritans, already too powerful for Charles; and if any other way could be found by which the army might be maintained in Ireland and the Government carried on, it would have been gladly resorted to by Ormonde. Indeed he seemed to postpone the Cessation from

* Irish Confederation and War, Vol. II., pp. 319 to 326.

time to time in the expectation that something would occur to make it unnecessary; but not the faintest ray of hope shone through the gloom which had settled over the King's affairs in England. "Amidst these extremities his Majesty's letters came over, signifying his Majesty's sorrow and disability to relieve us, in regard of the troubles in England. All men's eyes were on the Parliament, but no succours in those times arriving from thence, to support the forces, his Majesty *permitted* a treaty to be had with the Irish touching a Cessation of Arms, in case all other helps were failing; which was generally so disagreeing to the Board [of Privy Council] that most of them desired to run any fortune and extremity of famishing, rather than yield unto it. And truly I was so much of that opinion, that when the Marquis of Ormonde made offer that if he might be advanced £10,000, part victuals, part shoes and stockings, and part money, that he would immediately draw towards the rebels, and either compel them to run the hazard of the field, or to forsake their quarters, and leave them to the spoil of our soldiers, which might prove to them a future subsistence; and when Theodore Scout [he was Mayor of Dublin] and the rest of the merchants of Dublin had refused to advance the money upon the security of all the lands of the whole Board and the Customs of Dublin for the interest of the money, I moved the Board that every one for himself, out of his peculiar means and credit, would procure £300, which amongst us all would raise £6,300. For even with that sum and such means as the Marquis of Ormonde should procure himself, he offered to undertake the work and that there should be no further mention of a Cessation amongst us. But this motion of mine not finding place, the Cessation in short time began to be treated on."*

Other causes, no doubt, there were which protracted the negotiations for a Cessation. The Lords Justices were opposed to it. Parsons, to be sure had been dismissed and committed to prison charged with "highcrimes and misdemeanours,"† but his successor, Sir Henry Tichborne, was as strenuously opposed to it as Parsons, although from quite different motives. He says "when the

* *Tichborne's Siege of Drogheda*, p. 20. See also Carte's *Ormonde*, Vol. I., p. 437.

† Thus ended the iniquitous career of a man whose name it is sought to affix to an Irish town, instead of its ancient and unsullied designation, whereas those who seek to perpetuate the memory of that name ought to use their best endeavours to consign it to darkest oblivion, to bury it deep in some howling wilderness, where beasts of prey abound, and noxious weeds spring into poisonous luxuriance, or cast it into the deep, although the waters of the ocean would be insufficient to wash out its guilt—stains of blood and rapine. But

Cessation began to be treated on, it was, in sincerity of heart, as much hindered and delayed by him as was in his power; believing it would be hurtful to the public." He further says he "cast in rubs to lengthen the treaty, expecting daily relief and money from England."* Owen Roe O'Neill and his party seemed to regard a Cessation of arms as treason to the Catholic cause. The only persons who appeared to be really and thoroughly for it, were the Catholics of the Pale, and some others who desired peace and had an abhorrence of bloodshed.†

The Cessation was concluded, and the articles, eighteen in number, regulating it were agreed to at Sigginstown, [sometimes called Gigginstown‡] in the County Kildare, on the 15th September, 1643. They were signed by Ormonde on the part of the King, and by the Delegates of the Confederation on the part of the Catholics. The Catholic signatories were:—Lord Muskerry, Lucas Dillon, Nicholas Plunket, Robert Talbot, Richard Barnewall, Torlogh O'Neill, Geoffrey Browne, Eiver MacGennis and John Walsh. The articles secured for both parties—1. Free navigation of the seas; the landing of merchandize (even munitions of war), and its free transmission through the country. 2. They regulated the boundaries of the portions of the four Provinces which were to remain in the possession of each party, during the Cessation. 3. All prisoners were to be set at liberty, except such as were charged with special offences.§ Throughout the negotiations it must have been noticed, that the King, the Lords Justices, and Ormonde, showed a special desire to call the Catholics rebels, an epithet which their representatives always indignantly repelled. They had this much success at last in the

alas, for human weakness and blinded vanity, the name of Parsons is flaunted in our faces whenever we consult the Post Office Directory, as if it were a glory to Ireland, and an honour to human nature. The supersedeas to remove Parsons from office arrived in Dublin in the earlier days of May (N.S.) 1643. He was replaced by Sir H. Tichborne on the 12th, and on the 1st of August of the same year, the Lords Justices received an order from the King to arrest him, as also Sir J. Temple, Sir Adam Loftus, and Sir R. Meredith.

* History of the Siege of Drogheda, 4to Ed., p. 20.

† "There is never a man of any shallow understanding, being indifferent, but will palpably judge the contrivers of this Cessation to be both perjurers, infamous, disloyale, and treacherous." Aphorismical Discovery, Vol. I., p. 73.

‡ And by Castlehaven "Suganstown near the Naase."

§ The Confederate Catholics also agreed to make a grant to the King of £30,000 to be paid half in money and half in beeves, in five separate payments before the end of the ensuing May. Also £800 within two months in place of corn due to some garrisons. This to be paid at Naas to whomsoever the Lords Justices would appoint. The beeves were to be "good marketable beeves, not under four or above ten years old, and to be delivered in Dublin at the rate of £30 the score." Billings' History of the Confederation and War, Vol. II., p. 379.

matter, that instead of rebels, they are, throughout the articles of Cessation, designated as "His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects now in arms."*

Immediately on the conclusion of the Cessation a joint Proclamation was issued announcing the fact to the country.

* The Articles of Cessation may be seen in full in the History of the Confederation and War, Vol. II., p. 365.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE Cessation of arms with the Irish Catholics was earnestly desired and sought for, although secretly, by the King. For this he had many and good reasons. 1. In the first place Cessation would enable him to transfer a considerable part of his Irish army to England, to oppose the forces of his rebellious Parliament. 2. Because that army could no longer keep the field in Ireland, for want of the commonest necessities of life. 3. Because he and Ormonde hoped, that once the Catholics had laid down their arms, they would not be very ready to take them up again. This was especially true of the Pale; but in fact no considerable portion of the Irish Catholics, as a body, would care to renew the conflict, if they got even a substantial portion of those rights for the securing of which they originally began it. It was hoped, too, that during the Cessation some permanent and peaceful arrangement might be arrived at, although plainly the whole question was beset with difficulties.

The first succours sent to Charles after the Cessation were from Munster. Lord Inchiquin dispatched two regiments under Sir Charles Vavasour before the middle of October; Sir W. St. Leger and Colonel Mynn sailed with two more about a month later, and the young Earl of Cork, at his own special request, embarked with his regiment, in the Christmas holidays. The ports of Munster were many and open, so that Inchiquin had no difficulty in sending away troops; but it was different in Leinster, because the ports of that province were blocked by the Parliament ships, to prevent the King from receiving assistance. Irish shipowners asked very large sums for hiring their vessels to transport troops from Leinster to England, under the reasonable fear of having them seized by the Parliament cruisers, or perhaps by the soldiers themselves, when they had got on board, as they could have them steered to any English port they pleased; "so that no contract was likely to be made till the Earl of Castlehaven arrived at Wexford, being employed by the General Assembly then held at Waterford. He found the charge of small barks to carry men, and of frigates to convey them, would be excessive, and took another method. He hired, at an easy rate, three ships of 400 tons

each, and mounted with sixteen or fourteen pieces of ordnance, and dispatched two of them on November 7th, to Dublin, the very day that Captain Baldwin Wake arrived there from Bristol, with two ships and five barks, to transport the army."* The exact number of men thus sent to the King cannot be determined. The Leinster troops were 3,000 on paper, but really consisted of no more than 2,000 effective men. Sir William Brereton, one of the Commanders of the Parliament troops, then overrunning Wales, estimates at 4,000 the soldiers sent against him from Ireland, and this estimate must be pretty nearly correct. These, of course, were all Englishmen who had been sent to Ireland against the Confederate Catholics, but Brereton "sent Warrants over the country, requiring all persons between sixteen and sixty, to take arms to oppose 4,000 bloody Irish rebels who were come to invade them."† "There could not be," seriously adds Mr. Carte, "a fouler aspersion upon a body of troops, who had underwent the extremest hardships in the prosecution of those rebels." But Brereton was equal to more than that; for on the very day he signed the Warrants, and dispersed them abroad, "he wrote a letter to Sir M. Erule and Colonel Gibson (then on ship board) extolling to the skies their brave adventures in Ireland in defence of the Protestant religion, confessing the unworthy reward the Parliament gave them for that service, desiring them to excuse that neglect, promising, if they would adhere to the Parliament, they should have all their arrears paid them without fail, and entreating them earnestly to parley with him."‡

The ships with the troops from Munster anchored in Mostyn Bay in Flintshire, on December the 3rd. These, with the 1,300 foot and 140 horse sent by Ormonde to Chester under Colonel Robert Byron, would bring the troops sent from Ireland up to about 6,000 horse and foot, altogether. They soon engaged the Parliament forces, and had several successes in the beginning, which led them to despise the Parliamentarians. This blunder was the cause of their sustaining a crushing defeat at Nantwich; so that the Irish contingent was not of much further service.

It was the King's original intention that the Marquis of Ormonde should take command of the troops sent to his assistance from Ireland, but affairs were so critical here that the idea

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 469.

† Ibid., 471.

‡ Mr. H. Byron's letter quoted by Carte, Vol. I., p. 471. This was pretty well for one of the leaders of the Army of the Lord.

had to be abandoned. A proposal was made by several leading Catholics that they would, in their individual capacity, raise regiments to constitute a Catholic army for the King's service in England, but this was not approved of by the Supreme Council, who refused to allow private persons to take upon themselves such an important office, holding that the raising and embodying of Catholic soldiers, for his Majesty, should be done publicly and officially by the Supreme Council itself, for which they were sharply chided by Ormonde. The truth is that Ormonde sought to turn the whole advantage of the Cessation, at once, to the King's service, leaving the claims of the Catholics for future consideration—a deception more than once resorted to before, as happened in the case of the "Graces." It was a grave mistake for the Catholics to have agreed to a Cessation at all; nor would they have done so, but for Ormonde's creatures in the Supreme Council. The Catholics of Ireland rose and fought for religious liberty, which the King was always promising, but never gave; and now that it was within their own grasp, they make a Cessation and pay £30,800 for it, and are, moreover, expected to allow all their quarters to be beaten up by Ormonde's supporters, in order to raise an army to be sent to England to fight for the King, who continually went back on his solemn engagements to them. Ormonde, in the meantime, was of course amusing them with his honied words and wily diplomacy. Had the Supreme Council allowed such an army to be got together, it might, before long, become independent of them.

As soon as the news of the cessation reached Oxford, the King resolved to make Ormonde Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, which was the best thing he could do under the circumstances. The appointment was made on the 29th of November, but contrary winds caused the journey of Sir P. Weymiss, who was the King's messenger on the occasion, to be so protracted, that Ormonde did not receive his powers until the middle of the following January, on the 21st of which month he was sworn in. Four things were specially recommended to his attention on assuming this high and important office:

"First, to prevent the breaking out of the Rebellion (*sic*) during the Cessation, to the prejudice of his Majesty's good subjects, and to his Majesty's scandal by the Cessation." By his Majesty's "good subjects" are here meant his Majesty's Irish protestant subjects. Lord Digby, whose letter I am quoting, says, he conceives this point "is principally to be secured by the *entertaining the Irish with hopes of good conditions from his Majesty, in those things upon which their hearts are most set,*

and by gaining upon the affections or ambitions of their principal leaders, so far forth as to draw them thence."

2. The second point urged upon Ormonde was to give his attention "to prevent the Scots drawing their army out of Ireland, upon which," says Lord Digby, "their invading England principally depends." He adds:—"We are informed that Monroe, and some other chief commanders among them are, as most of that nation, gainable by interest; which kind of persuasion on the King's part must be applied to them by *fit instruments and apt temptations*."

3. The third head under which Lord Digby gives the King's instructions (for they are the King's)* is, to dispose the principal Irish, *by all means possible*, to a willingness and readiness to come over with forces, either into England or Scotland, according as either shall be most requisite to his Majesty's affairs." Lord Digby adds, with regard to this third point, that Lord Antrim, who was raising an army to invade Scotland, in the King's interest, and who was also anxious to get the Scotch out of Ireland, should be "persuaded from" or "prevented in" such a proceeding, which must be looked upon as a ruinous and destructive thing, it being our work at present to keep the coast clear.

4. "And lastly," says Lord Digby "to procure all the arms and ammunition you can possibly from the Irish." And his lordship gives this further instruction: "Out of what store you shall procure from the Irish for his Majesty's service, your lordship be sure to furnish your forts and garrisons, unobserved to do it, that way; for, should the Cessation be broken, and the Irish possess themselves of any of his Majesty's strengths, it would be a heavy scandal upon him, and upon the whole management of his affairs. Care shall be taken to send what other provisions Wales or Bristol can afford for those forts."†

No wonder Charles was anxious for a Cessation with the Catholics, seeing what important advantages he derived and expected to derive from it. By the Cessation he saved a starving army, that must have otherwise collapsed in a few weeks. He received a present of over £30,000 from the Catholics on the occasion, although it was far more for his interest than theirs; and then, he not only expected the Catholics to lay aside

* Digby was at this time Secretary of State at Oxford.

† Lord Digby's letter to Ormonde, dated at Oxford the 29th of November, the same date as that in his appointment to the Lord Lieutenancy. Carte's Ormonde, Vol. III., pp. 213-14.

The Italics in the above extracts are mine.—J. O'R.

their arms at home, but to go to England to fight his battles, an arrangement that was to be brought about by "entertaining them with the hopes" of good conditions—hopes which, like the promised "Graces," were never meant to be realized; for, since the principal leaders of the Catholics were, according to his instructions to Ormonde, to be seduced from the Catholic cause, by working upon them through their "affections or ambitions," or perhaps by plying them with "apt temptations," like the Scotch, it is plain that Charles's object in the Cessation was to break up the Confederation, and to make dupes and tools of the Catholics for his own objects. Finally, Ormonde—the plausible and oily Ormonde—was to coax all the arms and ammunition he could from them, and for what purpose? Not for the King's service in England, but to strengthen the Irish forts against the givers of those arms, in order that they might be powerless when the time arrived when Charles, like a true Stuart, would find it his interest or convenience, once again, to ignore his solemn engagements.

But we must not pass over or underrate the King's difficulties. He did not at this period possess the power of free action; he could only temporize. Few men had in a more eminent degree than Charles the unfortunate propensity of missing happy opportunities. Ireland was now in arms for three years, not so much in opposition to him as against the tyranny and injustice inflicted upon the Catholics by men who governed in his name, as his trusted servants, but who were—and he knew it—his worst enemies. Had he, like an honourable man, redeemed his kingly word by giving the Irish the fifty "Graces" he had promised, and for which they paid him in advance, £140,000, they would be now, in his hour of peril, heart and soul with him; but he abused a golden opportunity, and deserved to suffer accordingly. At this juncture, even with Ormonde's great ability, he could do but little. He was hemmed in on all sides. The Puritans were not only in arms against him, but had, more than once, worsted him in the field. They had two principal objects, the abolition of episcopacy, and the annihilation of Popery; any concession, therefore, made to the Catholics, would be sure to provoke them and intensify their opposition. Again, the English episcopalians had a very thorough hatred for Popery. Many of them were faithful to Charles, and any large concession made to the Catholics would change them into enemies, or at least, cool down their ardour in his cause. In Ireland the episcopalians were not strong, but as in England, they were, for the most part loyal, and would certainly feel outraged by any concessions, which would tend to bring the

Catholics to a political level with themselves. Moreover, there were some 20,000 Scotch Puritan soldiers in Ulster. Monroe, who had been made General-in-Chief of the Ulster forces by the English Parliament, had brought over the Covenant agreed upon between the Scotch and the English Parliamentarians, with orders from the Commons to administer it to the officers and soldiers of the English army, although the King's Proclamation had been already published against it, in which he called it "a traitorous and seditious combination against him, and against the established religion and laws of the kingdom." The Marquis of Ormonde gave positive orders to all the officers under his command not to take it, but in vain; four Scotch ministers had been sent to preach up the Covenant, and on the 4th April, 1644, it was taken in the Church of Carrickfergus by Monroe and his officers, and in two days afterwards by all the soldiers.*

It is well here to note that there were two principal Scottish Covenants. 1. The National Covenant, which was drawn up at Edinburgh in 1638 by the chief Presbyterian ministers, and was soon adopted by a great number of persons of all ranks. It embodied the Confession of Faith of 1580 and 1581, which was subscribed by James VI. in his youth, and by his household. In 1587-8 it was again subscribed at Holyrood by the King, Lennox, Huntley, the Chancellor, and about ninety-five other persons. This National Covenant referred to Scotland only; it was ratified by a solemn oath binding those who took it "to continue in the obedience of the doctrine and discipline of the Kirk, and to defend the same all the days of their lives." They further swore to "adhere to the Written word," adding, "and therefore we abhor and detest all contrary religion and doctrine; but chiefly all kind of papistry in general and particular head, even as they are now damned and confuted by the Word of God and Kirk of Scotland. But especially we detest and refuse the usurped authority of that Roman Antichrist, upon the Scriptures of God, upon the Kirk, the civil magistrate, and consciences of men."

In a book entitled "Conferences of Faith and Catechisms of the Church of Scotland," the second Covenant called "the Solemn League and Covenant" is not printed as a distinct document, but in continuation of the National Covenant, thus,

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 490. "The country people as well as the soldiers taking it with as much zeal as if it were the only means of preserving both their souls and bodies." Ibid. "The Scots ministers preached up the Covenant in all places to be as necessary to salvation as the Sacrament, and would allow this to be given to no man who refused the other." Ibid., 492.

in some sort, uniting both into one Covenant. The leading feature in the Solemn League and Covenant is, that it is not confined to Scotland. Having subscribed the oath as in the National Covenant, the subscribers to the Solemn League and Covenant say, "they shall procure to the uttermost of their power to the Kirk of God, and *whole Christian people*, true and perfect peace in all time coming, and that they shall be careful to *root out of the Empire*, all heretics and enemies of the true worship of God, who shall be convicted by the true Kirk of God of the foresaid crimes." The "foresaid crimes" include all the chief doctrines of the Catholic Church, such as an idolatrous sacrifice "for the sins of the dead and the quick, blasphemous litanies, justification by works," &c. The Roman Antichrist is specially denounced with his "five bastard sacraments, his devilish Mass, his blasphemous priesthood," &c. They also solemnly promise to "stand to the defence of their dread sovereign, the King's Majesty, his person and authority," [being in open rebellion against him at the time], "the maintaining of the true religion and his Majesty's authority," with "our best council, our bodies, means, and whole power *against all sorts of people whatsoever*; so that whatsoever shall be done to the least of us for that cause, shall be taken as done to us all in general, and to every one of us in particular."*

As might be expected, the Cessation had not been long promulgated when both sides began to accuse each other of violating

* Those Covenants may be seen in the Westminster Confession of Faith. The Solemn League and Covenant, which was specially intended as a bond of union between the Scotch Puritans and the English Parliament was adopted by both Houses in June, 1643. "Members of the Commons, and from 20 to 30 peers, forming the upper House, took the oath. It was taken by the city of London, and imposed on all civil and military officers. 1,600, or about one-fifth of the whole number of beneficed clergy, lost their benefices for refusing the Covenant." *Wade's British History Chronologically arranged*. 2nd Ed. p. 188.

"This Covenant was read in St. Margaret's Church at Westminster, in presence of both Houses; and the Commons ordered that it should be taken next Sunday by all persons in their respective parishes. The Scots, on this occasion, were partly influenced by temporal interest and partly by fanaticism. They began to fear, that should the King triumph over the two Houses, he would retract all the concessions which had been extorted from him by the Scottish nation. They were inflamed with the hope of establishing their darling presbytery in England, and even extending it to the remotest regions, and some of them were allured with the prospect of sharing the spoils of the royalists." *Hume's History of England*, 3rd Ed. Vol. 7, p. 276.

"The English Parliament never intended to establish Presbytery, but found it convenient to their ends to give private assurance of their doing so; which were the more readily believed, because they had publicly declared for an extirpation of episcopacy, and called an assembly of divines, as fit as they could pick out for their purpose, under pretence of settling the government of the church." *Carte's Ormonde*. Fol. Ed., Vol. I., p. 466.

it. Lord Inchiquin, under twelve heads, brought an indictment against the Catholics for breaches of it in Munster. The most important of them was the first, in which his lordship complains that he did not get the fourth sheaf in Barrymore or Imokilly, according to the articles of Cessation. But the article of the Cessation (the seventh) regulating that point is accompanied by certain conditions, of which he says nothing, and which may have justified the Catholics in withholding the fourth sheaf. They were also accused of not paying up the £30,000 agreed upon at the Cessation, but when Ormonde called upon their delegates to do so at the meeting in Dublin in July, 1644, they replied that it had not only been paid in full, but had been overpaid, as they would undertake to prove when they came to particulars. Free passage for both sides through each other's quarters, had been provided for by the Cessation, and also free commercial traffic; but these stipulations seem to have been more or less violated by the Catholics, especially in Connaught. Still such breaches must have been local and insignificant, for Carte says, "the Cessation was submitted to by *all* the Irish party, and by the generality of the English;"* and that "Owen O'Neill had observed it so rigorously, that when some of the garrison of Enniskilling made him an offer of betraying the place, he would not embrace it, though great preys had been taken from the Irish in the excursions made by that garrison in their districts for want of provisions."†

Ormonde had no desire whatever that the Cessation should be broken. It was brought about by his management and meant solely for the King's interest, and the year during which it was to last he intended to use for the breaking up of the Confederation. To effect this object he requested the King to authorize him "to receive to mercy, and grant pardon for life and lands to such of the rebels as should return to his Majesty's obedience. By this means he did not question, in case any disturbance should be endeavoured by the worst affected, *to divide them*, so as to defeat their attempts, and *preserve his Majesty's protestant subjects*."‡ The Irish agents who had been sent to Oxford, discovered there, that Ormonde had sent this advice to the King, and in their letter of April 7, 1644, to the Supreme Council, warned them "that he had desired a Commission

* Life of Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 485.

† Ibid., p. 495. "Sir William Cole and the Scots of Donegal, at several times, have taken 1,500 cows from the Irish since the Cessation." Letter of Daniel O'Neill to Ormonde. Carte, Vol. III., colxxiii. p. 284.

‡ Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 483. The Italics in the extract are mine. J. O'R.

might be sent to enable him to warrant the submission of such as would desire it, and to pass them pardons." "This," say they, "is a dangerous way to break our Association." "They had reason to say so," adds Carte, "for it was the very method by which Henry IV. broke the Holy League in France."*

But all who leaned to the views of the English Parliament were against it, (1) because they knew it would strengthen the King's cause, and (2) because they looked upon it as a surrender to Popery. The first motion they kept in the back-ground, the second they put prominently forward; the English Parliament, in their protest against the Cessation, giving themselves credit for having "taken the troubles of Ireland to heart, with that resentment and compassion as may evidence their zeal to religion, their love to their distressed countrymen and brethren there in these times." What a reckless assertion, from men who had refused all supplies to the King's forces in Ireland, some of their principal men, a short time before, having declared (in answer to an urgent request for provisions), that if £500 were to save Ireland, they would not spare it.† They proceed in their Declaration to say, "the reducing of Ireland hath still been a chief part of the care of this Parliament; and God hath been pleased to bless our endeavours with such success, as that those furious blood-thirsty papists have been stopped in the career of their cruelty; some part of the protestant blood, which at first was spilt like water upon the ground, hath been revenged; their massacres, burnings, and famishings have, by a divine retaliation, been repaid into their bosom." They absurdly understate the wants of the English forces in Ireland, and quite overstate the necessities of the Catholic army, which they say are in a far worse condition than the others, "being in want of most things necessary, not only for the maintaining of a war, but even of life, the judgment of God being remarkable upon them in this, that as their bloody and treacherous religion made them inhumanly cruel in shedding the protestants' blood, so now the famine amongst many of them, hath made them unnaturally and cannibal-like, eat and feed one upon another. Therefore, that they may have time to expect from their friends abroad new supplies, both of victuals and ammunition, and may without molestation reap the fruit of this harvest, they have laboured a treaty for a Cessation; which project of theirs doth no less aim

* Ibid.

† Carte's *Ormonde*, Vol. I., p. And a leading personage told Major Warren "that they had not leisure to step over the threshold for Ireland." Ibid.

at the overthrow of the remainder of the protestants in that Kingdom, than their treacherous taking of arms at first, did intend the destruction of them all; for *their Cessation and Hostility, their war and peace, are alike to be esteemed of, and with those that neither in peace nor war keep any faith, it is best to be in perpetual defiance.*" "The Lords and Commons," they say, "have reason to declare against this plot and design of a Cessation of Arms, as being treated and carried on without their advice, as also because of the great prejudice which will thereby redound to the Protestant religion, and the encouragement and advancement which it will give to the practice of Popery, when these rebellious Papists shall, by this agreement, continue and set up with more freedom their idolatrous worship, the popish superstitions and Romish abominations, in all the places of their command, to the dishonouring of God, and grieving of all true protestant hearts, the disposing of the laws of the Crown of England, and to the provoking of the wrath of a jealous God, as if both Kingdoms hath not smarted enough already for this sin of too much conniving at and tolerating of anti-Christian idolatry, under pretext of civil contracts, and politick agreements."*

The Protestant Dr Leland, fellow of Trinity College, says of the document from which the above extracts are made:—"The falsehoods by which this declaration is disgraced are, indeed, flagrant but possibly not altogether intentional. It is certain that the great partizans of the Parliament in Dublin were, about this date, detected in transmitting the most scandalous misrepresentations of the state of Irish affairs."†

The taking of the Covenant made rapid progress in Ulster, partly because the Scots (especially the new Scots) and the protestant inhabitants of that Province were for it; and partly because the pay of the army was in great arrear, and neither the King nor Ormonde had funds at their disposal to meet the difficulty. About this time, the famous Owen Connolly, the informer (now Captain O'Connell), was dispatched by the Parliament to the English Colonels in Ulster to induce them to take the Covenant, and to carry on the war, promising supplies for their maintenance on complying with these conditions. The London Adventurers sent over an agent at the same time, who urged the same views and gave the same assurances.‡ The

* Declaration of the Parliament against the Cessation. Cox; *Hibernia Anglicana*, Vol. II., Appendix xviii., p. 68.

† History of Ireland, 4to. Ed. Vol. III., p. 212.

‡ Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 486. The London Adventurers feared that they would be in danger of losing the lands they had acquired in Ireland, if terms were made with the Irish.

English forces in Ulster were in a very embarrassing position. The Colonels under Ormonde's command were averse to taking the covenant, but they had neither pay nor a supply of provisions for their men. They did not publish the King's proclamation against it, which had been sent to them with orders to do so, at the head of their regiments; because they feared to provoke Monroe, who was far too powerful for them, should they excite his active hostility. The English Colonels met in Belfast to discuss what was best to be done, and to draw up letters in reply to those sent to them by the Parliament and the Adventurers. They made a private agreement among themselves to persevere in their allegiance to the King, to continue to obey Ormonde as their commander, and to avoid accepting the Covenant. These resolutions they came to by an informal understanding (no doubt designedly informal), and said nothing about them in their answers to the Parliament or to the Adventurers, which were couched in such terms as would be likely to induce both these parties to send them supplies.

The Ulster protestants seem to have got into a perfect craze about the Covenant, and they, as well as the soldiers, took it with as much avidity as if it were the only means under heaven of preserving both their souls and bodies. They refused maintenance to any soldiers who would not take it; and the officers of the old Scots, although not much inclined to it at first, began to take it privately; and so many had done so before their Colonels discovered the fact, that they thought it too late to attempt to put any stop to it. All the new Scots took it two days after it was taken by Monroe and his officers in the church of Carrickfergus.

The taking of the Covenant and the breaking of the Cessation went hand in hand; and the ships that arrived from the Parliament with provisions for the army brought orders that those provisions should be distributed to none but such as opposed the Cessation.* The soldiers who had been sent from Scotland under Monroe's command—known as the new Scots, because they were the latest arrivals from that country—were opposed to the Cessation from the beginning, whereby they only carried out the orders of those who had sent them.† Monroe, although generally well enough inclined to take his ease, was guilty of an act of wicked hostility and foul treachery in connection with the Cessation; for "as soon as that general," says Carte, "received an

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 490.

† The Earl of Castlehaven calls the old Scots "natives" of the Province of Ulster. *Memoirs*, p. 65.

authentick account of its being concluded, he fell upon the Irish peasants, who were getting in their harvest in great security, as no longer thinking of an enemy, and made a slaughter among them, but thought fit to retire immediately afterwards to Carrickfergus, giving out that he would do nothing in violation of it, till he received directions for his conduct from the State of Scotland and the Parliament of England. He soon after received orders to break the Cessation, and thereupon publicly declared his resolution of carrying on the war against the Irish.”*

As the Scottish army (consisting of new and old Scots) was about seventeen thousand strong at this time, Owen Roe O'Neill's position was a most difficult one, since Monroe had declared he would carry on the war regardless of the Cessation. Owen was far too weak to risk a battle with Monroe, and it was all but impossible for him to provide food for his troops in Ulster, the Scots held so much of that province in their hands. O'Neill kept his ground by acting on the defensive, aided probably by the fear which his reputation as a general inspired. When Monroe declared he would not observe the Cessation, O'Neill proceeded to Waterford where the Supreme Council then was, to lay the perilous state of his affairs before them, and to ask for assistance, and unless it was granted, he assured them he would be compelled to withdraw into Leinster in order to get subsistence for his troops, as Ulster was substantially closed against him by the Scots. This declaration quickened the action of the Supreme Council, for they feared if O'Neill retired upon Leinster, the Scots would be likely soon to follow him, an occurrence which the Council very much desired to avoid. So they agreed to send 6,000 foot and 600 horse into Ulster, O'Neill undertaking to join them with 4,000 foot and 400 horse. Lord Castlehaven was elected general of this force, a fact, he says, which very much annoyed O'Neill who hoped to have got the appointment himself. However, the General Assembly, by their votes, appointed Castlehaven, fearing, no doubt, to place such a power in the hands of one whom the Catholics of the Pale suspected of ulterior objects; for as to generalship, no one would, for a moment, put Castlehaven in competition with Owen Roe; and the latter could not but feel aggrieved and insulted at having Castlehaven sent to take supreme command in the province of which he was the appointed general.

Castlehaven's Ulster campaign, even on his own showing, was not a success. The author of the *Aphorismical Discovery* (whom

* Carte, Vol. I., p. 485.

Carte says was O'Neill's secretary, which J. T. Gilbert denies) represents it as little short of a disaster, and certainly his return to Leinster partook more of a flight than a well-ordered retirement. Soon after his arrival in Ulster he permitted Monroe to get between him and his supplies, which made it difficult for him to obtain army provisions.* So sorely distressed was he that he at length "decamped suddenly," not even informing O'Neill of his intention, "and marched fifty miles in twenty-four hours, making no halt till he arrived at Clunnies [Clones], on the borders of the County Cavan, where he was better supplied."† The blame of the comparative failure of this expedition is thrown on O'Neill by Castlehaven, and on Castlehaven by the author of the *Aphorismical Discovery*. It is evident the two commanders did not act in unison. On one occasion three troops of O'Neill's horse were posted at a pass on the Blackwater between Benburb and Kinnaird [Caledon] to keep the Scots from spoiling the country on the Dungannon side, but they were beaten off with loss by the enemy, Captain Hovenden and Art Oge O'Neill having been killed, and Con Boccagh O'Neill wounded: "this being done," says Carte, "before the face of Lieutenant-Colonel Fennel, who, with a strong squadron of the Leinster horse looked on and flatly refused to relieve them, which exceedingly disgusted Owen (who was sick at the time), and seems to be the first occasion of the jealousy between the Ulster Irish and those of the other provinces, which afterwards proved so detrimental to the affairs of the Confederates."‡

The Earl of Antrim, the head of the clan MacDonnell in Ireland, whose grandfather came into Ulster from Scotland, undertook to raise 10,000 men for the King's service. He had many friends and connections of position, some of them being members of the Supreme Council, and by his influence with them, which his self-conceit greatly exaggerated, he made no doubt of his power to carry out this splendid project. His ambition was great, and he believed himself equal to any undertaking, although his abilities were of a limited and very ordinary kind, and were marred, besides, by much unsteadiness of

* *Aphorismical Discovery*, Vol. I., pp. 85-6.

† Carte's *Ormonde*, Vol. I., p. 516.

‡ Carte's *Ormonde*, Vol. I., p. 515. It was not so much a manifestation of the jealousy between the Ulster Irish and those of the other three provinces, as it was an expression of the want of sympathy between the Catholics of the Pale (whose general Castlehaven really was) and the old Irish Catholics. Doubtless Castlehaven's jealousy of O'Neill had also something to do with it. Both Castlehaven and Fennel were devoted friends of Ormonde; they might, perhaps, be even called his tools.

purpose. The King received him favourably at Oxford, encouraged him in his undertaking, and made him a marquis. Ultimately all he succeeded in doing was to raise 2,000 men, whom he sent into Scotland to aid Montrose. He remained in Ireland himself, where a dispute arose between him and Castlehaven as to which of them should be Commander-in-Chief of the Confederate forces. Their quarrel gave much trouble, whilst the great man, who alone could save Ireland, was left to waste his unrivalled military skill in trying to hold his own against fearful odds in Ulster. Neither of the rivals would yield to the other, but they at last agreed to accept Ormonde as generalissimo of the Confederate forces. It was a strange proposal, but showed unmistakably what great influence he had in the Supreme Council. He was sounded on the matter, but declined the proffered command, saying, to do so would not be "for the King's honour and service." The affair was therefore dropped.

One of the conditions of the Cessation was, that the Confederation should have the privilege of sending agents to place their grievances before the King at Oxford. This was done whilst the events which we have just passed under review were occurring. In the November following the Cessation, the General Assembly met at Waterford, and selected for that important duty Lord Muskery, Alexander M'Donnell, Nicholas Plunket, Sir Robert Talbot, Dermot O'Brien, Richard Martin, and Geoffrey Browne. They obtained from the Lords Justices the necessary safe-conducts. The King wrote to Ireland for Commissioners to assist him in the negotiations. The Lords Justices, not being as yet out of office, sent him Archbishop Usher and the leading government lawyers. To others he sent special summonses, namely, to Lord Kerry, Sir Gerald Lowther, Sir W. Stewart, and Justice Donnillau. "Some particular protestants moved that they might have leave to send over in that capacity, Captain MacWilliam Ridgeway, Sir Thomas Hamilton, Captain Michael Jones, and Fenton Parsons."* To this petition his Majesty graciously consented.

The agents of the Confederate Catholics arrived in Oxford on the 23rd of March, 1644, and on the 28th presented a list of the concessions they were authorised to ask for; but these being considered too extreme by the chief men about the King, they were advised to re-consider them, which they did, and presented them, in a new form, some time afterwards. Their principal demands were:—

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 499.

1. Freedom for the Catholic religion, and repeal of the Penal Laws.
2. The calling of a free Parliament, and the suspension of Poyning's Act during its sitting.
3. The annulling of all acts and ordinances of the Irish Parliament since August 7th, 1641.
4. The vacating of all indictments, attainders, outlawries and grants depending thereupon, or in prejudice of the Irish Roman Catholics, found and passed since the said days.
5. A general act of oblivion extending to all persons and goods.
6. An act of limitation for the security of estates.
7. The removal of the marks of incapacity on the natives to purchase lands, leases, or offices.
8. The University and Schools to be free.
9. Places of command, profit, and trust, to be conferred on Roman Catholic natives, equally and indifferently with other subjects.
10. That the Court of Wards be taken away.
11. That an act should be passed declaring the Kingdom and Parliament of Ireland independent of those of England.
12. That as they [the Catholics] had been taxed with many inhuman cruelties which they never committed, they, to manifest their desire to have such heinous offences punished, and the offenders brought to justice, desired that all notorious murders, breaches of quarter, and inhuman cruelties committed at either side, might be questioned in the next Parliament, if his Majesty thought fit, and such as should appear to be guilty, to be excepted from the Act of Oblivion, and punished according to their deserts.

"Upon the grant of these propositions, they professed themselves ready to contribute 10,000 men towards suppressing the unnatural rebellion in England, and further to expose their lives and fortunes to serve his Majesty, as occasion should require."*

When the King sent to the Lords Justices for a list of persons from whom he might select councillors to aid him in his negotiations with the Catholic delegates, they named amongst others, Sir Charles Coote, the son and successor of that Sir Charles who burned the statue of Our Lady of Trim, and who lost his life so mysteriously immediately afterwards. He was not one of those selected by the King, yet he appeared afterwards in Oxford as the leading man of those "particular protestants," whose real

* Carte's *Ormonde*, Vol. I., p. 501.

business there was to oppose the demands of the Catholics by making these counter demands.

1. They ask his Majesty to abate his quit rents for a time, to encourage and enable protestants to re-plant the Kingdom, and cause a good walled town to be built in every county, for their security, no papist being permitted to dwell therein.
2. That the Penal Laws should continue in force, and be put in execution.
3. That no person should fill the office of a Magistrate in a corporation, or of a Sheriff or Justice of the Peace in a county, and that no lawyer should be allowed to practise, without taking the oath of supremacy and allegiance.
4. That a competent protestant army should be established in the Kingdom.
5. That nothing should be done in any respect derogatory to Poyning's Law.
6. That there be a present dissolution of the assumed power of the Confederates.
7. That the attainders had by outlawry for treason done in the rebellion, might be confirmed by Act of Parliament, and that such rebels as were not yet indicted, convicted, or attainted by outlawry or otherwise, might, upon proof of their offences, be, by the like Acts of Parliament, convicted and attainted, *and their estates forfeited*. They went on to say that all the rents due from Michaelmas, 1641, by the protestants, should be paid up by such Confederates as had profited by them; with much more to the same effect.
8. Finally, they demanded that Popery and Popish Recusants should be suppressed, and that all Popish Priests should be banished out of Ireland; that no Popish Recusant should be allowed to vote or sit in Parliament; and that the King would take all forfeited estates into his own hands, and after having made satisfaction to such as claimed by former acts of Parliament, dispose of the rest to British and Protestants, to plant the same upon reasonable and honourable terms.

It is remarkable in these demands, as in so many others made by the same party, that their enthusiastic zeal against Pope and Popery never blinded them to their material interests. To seize the lands of the idolatrous papists, and hand them over to God's chosen people (themselves), was the dominant note of their every petition.

Of the above demands Carte writes:—

“These propositions for putting the Roman Catholics of Ireland under greater hardships than any they had ever complained of before, incapacitating them from all affairs whatever, disabling them from sitting in Parliament, (a privilege which they had always enjoyed, and from which alone they could expect any redress of future grievances), forfeiting all their estates real and personal; and yet obliging them, when their all was taken from them, to make impossible reparations and satisfactions for losses sustained, and devastations committed in the war, suppressing their religion, banishing all their clergy, and new planting the Kingdom, were evidently calculated to hinder any peace at all, and certainly came from some of that party of men, which first formed the design of an extirpation of the Roman Catholics, and by publishing that design made the rebellion so general as it proved at last.”*

A Committee of the King's Privy Council examined these propositions, and being apprehensive that ill consequences might result from them, Sir Charles Coote and those acting with him were requested to withdraw them, or to propose some plan by which they could be carried into effect, in the existing state of the King's affairs. They refused to withdraw their propositions; and as to the way of effecting their desires, *they left that to the King's Council*. “In short, they constantly demanded that the Cessation should be dissolved, the war carried on with the utmost rigour, and no peace made with the Irish on any conditions.”† No doubt there were many protestants in Ireland who did not and would not give their adhesion to Sir Charles Coote's demands, but it is equally certain that they embodied the wishes not only of the Puritan Party, but of many others.

Charles was in a dilemma; he was between two fires. If he made substantial concessions to the Irish Catholics he would intensify the opposition of his Puritan enemies throughout the three Kingdoms; if he did not make substantial concessions, no peace could be accepted by the Irish, and peace was, at the moment, a matter of life and death to him. Moreover, they were powerful; three-fourths of the Kingdom was in their hands; and, unlike Monroe and his Covenanters, they were loyal subjects only seeking their just rights. The King was forced to be diplomatic; so he temporized. He reviewed the demands of the Catholic Deputation. Some he said he could not grant; others, chiefly of minor importance, he expressed his willingness to con-

* Life of the Duke of Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 592.

† Ibid., p. 504.

cede. With regard to others again, he gave kind but evasive answers; Poyning's Law he refused to suspend, even for one session. To the demand for the repeal of the Penal Laws he answered: "That as they never had been executed with rigour, so if his Recusant subjects, by returning to their duty and loyalty, merit his favour and protection, they should not for the future have cause to complain, that less moderation was used to them than had been in the most favourable times of Queen Elizabeth and King James, provided they lived quietly and peaceably according to their allegiance; and such of them as manifested their duty and affection to his Majesty should receive such marks of his favour in offices and places of trust, as should plainly show his good acceptance and regard of them."*

What amiable but what empty words! The old story. Leave yourselves in my hands. Trust to me. As if they had not trusted to him before, and as if he had not betrayed that trust. There was to be no legislation to establish their right to freedom, but they were expected to give him 10,000 men, as they had given him £140,000 before; which if they did "he would show his good acceptance and regard of them." The deputation in their revised demands asked nothing that was not already enjoyed by all the other subjects of the King in Ireland; yet they represented the vast majority of the Irish people. They had a government and an army stronger than the King's, they had been sent to treat, and they were diplomatized with honied words and sent home with a bag of moonshine.

The King's answer could give no satisfaction to the Catholic deputation, yet they replied to his Majesty with much humility and respect, after which they returned to Waterford to give an account of their mission to the General Assembly which was to meet on the 20th of February, 1644.

The Privy Council at Oxford appreciating the gravity of this "Irish difficulty," declined to deal with it, and advised the King to refer it to the Marquis of Ormonde, whose knowledge of the whole situation, combined with his well tried prudence, would enable him to deal with it more successfully than anybody else. It was accordingly handed over to him. Once again the General Assembly was called upon to appoint Commissioners to meet the Marquis and the Royal Commissioners in Dublin. They did so; and named amongst them Most Rev. Dr. Fleming, Archbishop of Dublin; but Ormonde objected to him, refusing, as

* Clarendon's *Rebellion and Civil Wars in Ireland*, Dublin Ed., pp. 20-1. Carte's *Ormonde*, Vol. I., p. 507.

usual, to treat with Catholic ecclesiastics. The Archbishop was, accordingly, withdrawn from the list of Commissioners, as was also the Marquis of Antrim, Sir Richard Everard, and Richard Martin. The Commissioners sat for the first time on September 6th, the first business transacted being the renewal of the Cessation to December 1st. The Irish Commissioners presented the same propositions which they had laid before the King's Council at Oxford. These were discussed by both sides for four days, without any practical result, the government lawyers opposing to the Irish demands a great deal of special pleading, and fine drawn objections, while conceding at the same time some of the minor demands.

Ormonde in his turn made claims on behalf of the King, the protestant clergy and the protestant laity of Ireland.

1. On behalf of the King he demanded a *present* restitution of all the cities, towns, castles, forts, lands, artillery, arms and ammunition, possessed by the Roman Catholic Confederates, and that the jurisdiction and government assumed by them should be *immediately* abrogated.

2. He insisted on their "answering" to the King all the rents, compositions, subsidies and customs due before October 23rd, 1641.

3. He demanded payment of the residue of the £30,800 stipulated by the Cessation, and of the customs of Waterford and Ross since that time.

4. For the protestant clergy he claimed, that they should be *immediately* restored to all the churches, jurisdictions and possessions, and be allowed one half of the tithe corn of the current year's harvest, for their present subsistence; and that all the houses and churches, as well cathedral as parochial, which had been demolished or defaced by the Roman Catholic party, should be repaired by them with all convenient speed, and put into as good condition as they were on October 23rd, 1641.

5. On behalf of his Majesty's protestant subjects, Ormonde's demands were, that *present* restitution should be made to them of all the castles of which they were possessed in the beginning of the rebellion; that all goods, evidences, and writings, delivered to Roman Catholics in trust, or pillaged by them, be restored, or that the proprietor be free to use his remedy for the recovery of his goods and repayment for damages.

6. That such castles and houses as were surrendered and afterwards demolished by the Roman Catholics, contrary to articles, should be rebuilt by those who destroyed them.

"The Irish Commissioners answered to these, that after a full settlement, reciprocal restitution should be made to the pos-

sessors thereof, on 22nd October, 1641, of all estates, except the territory of Idough,* and some lands in the County of Wicklow, whence the natives were, by an high hand, extrajudicially expelled since the year 1633; that they thought themselves more damnified by pillage and rapine than the Protestants; but to prevent endless suits and troubles, they conceived this matter fit to be seriously debated, and finally ended upon settlement; that they knew of no castle or fort demolished contrary to articles, but when the particulars should appear, they would give particular answers; and that as they themselves received no profits out of their estates in the Protestant quarters, they conceived it not equal, that the Protestants should receive the profit of theirs, until after a settlement; and then the profits of both were to be reciprocally received by all parties respectively.”†

What strikes one in these negociations is, that the Catholics were called upon to give up almost everything they possessed, *at once*; for it is hard to see what would remain to them after acceding to all Ormonde’s demands. And for what? To be tolerated, as they had been in the reigns of Elizabeth and James. We have only to go back to the confiscations, plantations and martyrdoms of those reigns, to understand what sort of toleration that was; but the concession, if it were such, was made entirely to depend on the word of a King who had shamefully broken his word with them before. They were to receive no legal recognition whatever. The Catholics, it is plain, sought the suspension of Poyning’s law, for one session, in order that the Irish Parliament, by its own untrammelled action, might legalise the concessions the King would grant, but this suspension he refused. No wonder the negociations were broken off, as they were, in the beginning of October.‡

The Catholics expressed their willingness to join the King’s troops against the Ulster Covenanters, and asked Ormonde to declare them rebels, which he refused to do. He endeavoured, however, to induce the Catholics to *harass them*; but this

* Idough was part of the territory of Dermot McMurrough, King of Leinster. It came into Strongbow’s possession by his marriage with Eva, Dermot’s daughter. Ormonde had a claim upon it for a time. It was ultimately sold to Mr. Wandsford, who was afterwards Lord Lieutenant, but the Earl of Arundel persisted in claiming it, through the marriage of one of his ancestors to the Earl of Pembroke’s daughter, Matilda. He had really no claim, and it was, I suppose, to protect Wandsford’s rights the above proviso was inserted.

† Carte’s Ormonde, Vol. I., pp. 519-20.

‡ This is the date Carte gives: Billings says the negociations were carried on from the 11th of September to the 11th of November, but the difference between old and new styles may have some thing to do with the discrepancy. Carte always used the N.S. See *Vindiciarum Catholicorum Hiberniæ*, p. 11.

scheme of playing off the two parties against each other failed, because the Catholics saw through it, and refused to come into it. Hemmed in on all sides, Ormonde requested the King to relieve him from the office of Lord Lieutenant. Colonel Barry, who proceeded to Oxford at this time, was charged by Ormonde "to assure his Majesty that it was not either weariness of the trouble, fear of the danger, or unwillingness to serve him further in that post, at his own charge, which moved the Lord Lieutenant to desire that he would otherwise dispose of that government and his own service; but a plain foresight that he must shortly quit it for want of bread, or become subject to the insolencies of the Irish or Covenanters, from either of which dishonours he humbly desired to be seasonably relieved."*

Whatever other motives Ormonde may have had in resigning the Lord Lieutenancy at this time, there was quite sufficient excuse for his doing so in the difficulties which surrounded him. Of course, the King could not accept his resignation, for he and his advisers felt that Ormonde's services in Ireland could not be dispensed with. So instead of doing so, Charles conferred some very substantial personal favours upon him, and enlarged his powers as Lord Lieutenant to such an extent, that they became almost regal. He authorized him, with the advice of the judges, to seize the estates of absentees, and apply them to state purposes, and thus lessen the public charge. A restriction was put on the granting of wardships, and the Court of Wards was no longer to have the power of granting them, except to such persons, and under such conditions as the Lord Lieutenant should approve of. This was a wholesome regulation; for the wardship of Wards, who were heirs to large estates, was not unfrequently purchased by clever speculators who wished to make money of them, or secure the Wards as husbands for their daughters. Authority was given Ormonde to terminate all *custodiams* previously granted, and to apply the profits of them to the support of the army.†

It may be seen from the above, that the King showed a greater inclination to deal liberally with the Catholics than Ormonde.

The personal favours conferred on Ormonde were:—(1) that

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 521.

† "Among other partialities and mismanagements, may be reckoned the *custodiams* which were granted [by the Lords Justices] at this time [1642] of the lands of rebels to their favourite officers of the army, and the creatures of the ministry. There was a specious pretence, indeed, of relieving some of the sufferers in this rebellion; of encouraging and subsisting some of the soldiers; of preserving the corn and grass to supply the army and other good subjects; and of keeping the rebels from these advantages. But, in fact, these *custodiams* were an obstruction to the service, by employing the troops upon them when

the King made his eldest son, Lord Ossory, a knight, which freed him from Wardship after his father's death; and (2) considering his services to the Crown, in which he had expended so great a portion of his private fortune, Charles ordered a Commission to examine into his accounts, in order to ascertain the monies he had expended in his service, "and upon certificate made to the Council, and their approbation thereof, directed effectual grants to be made to the said Marquis and his heirs, of so many of the manors and lands of the Crown, as should amount to £100 a year for every thousand pounds which he had expended in the service, or were due to him for his entertainments."*

In all his communications with the Catholics Ormonde persisted in calling them rebels, even when he had come to terms with them for a Cessation of hostilities—a fact which plainly made them belligerents; yet he refused to declare the Scots rebels, although they were fighting the King in England and Scotland, and if they were not doing so in Ireland, it was because Monroe wished to take his ease; but he remembered that the Scots in Ulster accepted the Covenant, and declared it a crime to keep the Cessation. The Parliament of England was long in open rebellion against the Sovereign; their ships guarded every harbour whence succour could reach him from Ireland, and at this time plans were concerted by them for seizing three of the principal Irish seaports, namely, Dublin, Drogheda, and Dundalk, all then held for Charles. Dublin was blockaded for the Parliament by one Captain Swanley,† who opened communications with the disaffected in the city; but Ormonde receiving timely notice of the intended attack took measures by which it was averted. But Drogheda was in much greater danger than Dublin of falling into the hands of the King's Puritan enemies. Lady Alice Moore, the widow of Viscount Moore, encouraged the enterprise on that place with all her influence, and this, like many such undertakings, would have succeeded but for one mishap—the old one,—the plot was

they should have been sent against the enemy; and the officers to whom they had been granted were so intent upon their gain, that notwithstanding the public necessities, they would not send their corn to supply the markets, without an extravagant price. A crime, perhaps, more notorious among the English than any other civilized people under the sun!" *The History of the Rebellion and Civil War in Ireland*, by Fred. Warner, LL.D. 2nd Ed., p. 215.

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 521.

† "On Tuesday, June 5th, 1644, the ever zealous Captain Swanley received the thanks of the House and a gold chain of the value of £200, 'for good service at the Isle of Wight, Pembroke, and Carmarthenshire.'" *Godwin's Civil War in Hampshire*, p. 157.

discovered in time to prevent its execution. One George Stroude, who was supposed to be a staunch parliamentarian, was let into the secret, put the authorities in possession of it, and so it fell through almost at the last moment.

After Lord Moore was killed at Portlester, as already related, all his offices were conferred on his son, who though considerably under age, was made governor of the very important seaport of Dundalk, and soon proved by his conduct that he was less for the King than for the Parliament. He was in Dublin when the plot to surprise and take Drogheda was discovered. He immediately hastened to Dundalk, where "the first thing he did was to give orders for the seizing of Captain Townley, and Captain Constable, the two principal commanders, and best affected to the King of any in the garrison."*

Ormonde, by his tact, got young Moore into his power, treated him with "great tenderness," and giving the governorship of Dundalk to Captain Gibson sent Moore soon afterwards to the Court of England. Notwithstanding his minority, the King ordered livery to be granted to him of his father's lands, and empowered the Lord Lieutenant to restore him to his posts whenever he should see fit to do so; thus giving a further proof of what has become a historic truism, that one of the principal causes why the House of Stuart went to ruin was, that whilst it petted and patronised its enemies, it treated its friends and supporters with ill-disguised neglect.

There can be no reasonable doubt but young Lord Moore was privy to the attempts on Dublin, Drogheda, and Dundalk; but be that as it may, Monroe was a principal in the business; still Ormonde persisted in refusing to regard him and his soldiers as rebels, whilst with equal persistence he refused to call the Irish Catholics anything else than rebels, although they were ready to join him in fighting the King's battles in Ireland if he would only declare the Scots rebels, which Carte evidently thinks he ought to have done, and which was pressed upon him by his friend, Clanrickard, that very mild and loyal Palesman. Ormonde, however, coolly asked the Irish to go to Scotland and fight under Montrose, and he expressed disappointment if not indignation, because they refused to do so, although it was a proposal to which they could not in conscience accede, because "they had taken a firm resolution 'to send no more men to the King's assistance till a peace was settled, and such a peace as should show the world that they had really taken arms

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 526.

for the sake of Religion, and to establish it in its full splendour.”*

The Treaty of Peace was renewed after some time, and each side showed a disposition to make concessions; the Irish no longer insisted on the suspension of Poyning's Act; Ormonde agreed to the abolition of the Court of Wards, and yielded some other points, but he took care not to let the Irish agents know the large discretionary powers the King had vested in him in treating with them. It was hoped that a peace might be arranged through these mutual concessions; “but,” says his admiring biographer, “one use at least the Marquis of Ormonde could make of them, being (as they were sufficient to satisfy the more moderate part of the Roman Catholics) enabled thereby to *divide their party*, and baffle the measures and designs of the more violent.”†

Some further negotiations took place before the Earl of Glamorgan's arrival in Ireland, but they came to nothing. Had Ormonde followed the King's strongly expressed wishes, and met the Catholics in a generous spirit at the time they had made their lowest demands, a peace could have been made that might have preserved his crown for Charles. The Catholics repeatedly offered 10,000 troops for service in England, but Ormonde always kept to the same system—to get everything *at once* from them, and give them nothing, or next to nothing, in return. They were expected to be content with feeble, slippery promises, without any time being specified for their fulfilment, whilst they were called upon to meet all their engagements to the King without delay.

* Register, p. 151. Quoted by Carte, Vol. I., p. 530.

† Life of Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 541.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE EARL OF GLAMORGAN'S MISSION TO THE CONFEDERATE CATHOLICS.

THE Earl of Glamorgan's mission to the Irish Catholics is a very tangled historical skein in the history of Charles the First's reign, but one not incapable of being unravelled. Some writers have thrown doubts on the authenticity of the powers which he claimed to have received from the King, but whoever will take the trouble to read through the history of the affair will place but little value on the unproved assumptions put forward to discredit him. Charles's plans were almost continually failing, sometimes for want of rapidity and energy in their execution, sometimes because his secrets were badly kept by those about him, and sometimes because he was untrustworthy—not to say dishonourable—in his dealings with others. He had a fertile brain, and when one expedient failed, he set about constructing another. Ormonde never showed a disposition to satisfy the Catholics, partly because they demanded a great deal more than he thought he ought to concede, and partly because his determination was to make them the fewest possible concessions. The King, at length, finding his affairs desperate, saw nothing could retrieve them but the bringing of an Irish army to England, and to effect this he knew the Catholics must be satisfied, whilst at this juncture nothing would satisfy them but concessions, some of which he could not make public, as their publication would disgust the protestants who still adhered to him, and cause them to abandon him. He, therefore, resolved to employ an agent who would make certain concessions in public, and be authorized to promise much greater ones in private. For this important and difficult business he chose the Lord Herbert, whom he created Earl of Glamorgan.* He was the son of the Marquis of Worcester; and he and his father were enthusiastically attached to the King, both being also devoted Catholics. They had spent £200,000 in sustaining the Royal cause, and had publicly avowed that they were determined to stand or fall by it.

* Carte, in his zeal against this nobleman, pretends he was not created the Earl of Glamorgan, but Birch puts the fact beyond doubt.

The reason why negotiations with the Irish Catholics were at last entrusted to other hands than those of Ormonde is clear enough. Ormonde was urged by Charles to make peace with the Catholics on almost any terms, in order to obtain their aid against his English enemies, but that skilful tactician, by many shifts and delays, avoided carrying out the King's wishes in the matter; a chief reason for which is said by a very pronounced protestant writer to have been, that "the Marquis of Ormonde was so zealous a protestant, that he was absolutely averse to the granting of the terms upon which the Irish rebels insisted;"* and the author of the Nuncio's Memoirs complains of him for not obeying the King's orders in making peace with the Irish, though he knew how strongly his Majesty desired it, and how much he wanted their assistance.† Catholic swords and Catholic money Ormonde was most anxious to secure for his master; but if the Catholics were sure to keep the crown on the King's head, in spite of all his enemies, Ormonde and almost every protestant from him down to the lowest amongst them would think the service too dearly bought if it were to raise the Catholics to a level with any of the King's other subjects, no matter how few or insignificant they might be, or how gross or absurd their religious tenets.‡ And Ormonde, usually so reticent of his real views, was frank enough on this head with Lord Digby, the Secretary of State, when he thus emphatically addressed him:—"One thing I shall beseech you to be careful of, which is, to take order that the *commands* that shall be directed to me touching this people [the Irish] (if any be), *thwart not the grounds I have laid to myself in point of religion*; for in that, and in that only, I shall resort to the liberty left to a subject, to obey by suffering.

* Birch's Inquiry into the Share which King Charles the I. had in the transactions of the Earl of Glamorgan, for bringing over a body of Irish rebels to assist that King in the years 1645 and 1646. 2nd Ed., London, MDCCLVI. p. 12.

† Ibid.

‡ "In endeavouring to secure the loyalty of Roman Catholic Irishmen, we were met by religious antagonism as much as by antipathy of race. The fault was entirely our own, for the whole history of civilized communities records no more striking absence, not to say ignorance, of statesmanship, than was for generations manifested by English politicians of both parties in the realm, in their dealings with the religious difficulty in Ireland. The difficulty was one entirely of their own creating, for experience has amply proved that where Roman Catholics enjoy full liberty to practise their religion, and are subjected to no pains and penalties on account of their creed, they are every whit as loyal as any other section of the community." *Leader in Standard Newspaper*, 28th December, 1882.

What a reflection, not only on Ormonde and his contemporaries, but upon statesmen of far more modern times!

And this, I mention, lest the King's service should suffer in my scrupulousness in things another would find less difficulty in."*

Glamorgan's powers from the King were of a very extraordinary kind. 1. He received authority to coin money in any part of the realm; to levy men, and to use the revenues of the Crown for their support. 2. He was furnished with a warrant to grant, on certain conditions, to the Catholics of Ireland, such concessions as it was not prudent for the King or the Lord Lieutenant to make public. 3. He held a promise from Charles to ratify whatever engagements he (Glamorgan) should make, even though contrary to law. "So great," says the King, "is the confidence we repose in you, as that whatever you shall perform, as warranted under our *sign manual*, *pocket signet*, or *private mark*, or even by word of mouth, without further ceremony, we do, in the word of a King and a Christian, promise to make good to all intents and purposes, as effectually as if your authority from us had been under the Great Seal of England, with this advantage, that we shall esteem ourself the more obliged to you for your gallantry in not standing upon such nice terms to do us service, which we shall, God willing, reward. And although you exceed what law can warrant, or any powers of ours reach unto, as not knowing what you have need of, yet, it being for our service, we oblige ourself, not only to give you our pardon, but to maintain the same with all our might and power."† 4. Glamorgan was furnished with the letters for the Pope, the Nuncio, and the several princes from whom assistance might be expected. The knowledge of these documents was carefully concealed from the Council, and the Earl's commission was not made out in the usual manner.

Charles's deception and subtilty are conspicuous in these instruments; for they were, in many respects, informal. Blanks were left for the names of persons to whom the letters were to be addressed, and they were in several other particulars imperfect. All this was done that Charles, if he found it necessary, might be in a position to deny his responsibility with regard to the powers conveyed by them.

Glamorgan left Oxford in March, 1645, but had much difficulty in reaching Ireland, where he did not arrive until the end

* Letter to Lord Digby from Castletown (Delvin), 25th December, 1646. Carte, Vol. III. No. DXXV., p. 534. Cox's History of Ireland, Vol. II., p. 184. Birch's Inquiry, p. 13.

† Birch's Inquiry, p. 18. Nuncio's Memoirs, fol. 715. Lingard, Vol. 8, 6th Ed. Appendix, 307. Dr. Lingard prints the full text of the document, which, he says, he transcribed from a MS. in his possession "attested by the Earl's signature, and probably the very same which he gave to Ormonde, after his arrest and imprisonment." See Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 554.

of great or beginning of August. On one occasion he was in July, danger of being taken by a Parliament ship, which he escaped by putting into a small port in Cumberland. Having landed in Dublin, he was present at an interview between Ormonde and a deputation from the Confederate Catholics. Ormonde not yielding to their demands, they returned to Kilkenny, Glamorgan following them soon after, in order to treat with the Catholics according to the Commission given to him by the King. His concessions about the freedom of religion were to be the subject of a private treaty, whilst the political articles were to be made public. Father Scarampi delivered a paper to the Confederates against making a public peace with Ormonde and a private one with Glamorgan, thereby separating the political from the religious articles, an arrangement to which he was opposed; but in spite of his opposition the private treaty was concluded between the Irish Commissioners and Glamorgan on the 25th of August, 1645. Its articles were:

1. That all the professors of the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland shall enjoy the free and public use and exercise of their religion.

2. That they shall hold and enjoy all the churches by them enjoyed within that kingdom, or by them possessed at any time since the 23rd of October, 1641, and all other churches in the said kingdom, other than such as are now actually enjoyed by his Majesty's Protestant subjects.

3. That all Roman Catholics shall be exempted from the jurisdiction of the Protestant clergy; and that the Roman Catholic clergy shall not be punished or molested for the exercise of their jurisdiction over their respective Catholic flocks.

4. That the following act shall be passed in the next Parliament to be holden in Ireland. [*Here is inserted the form of an Act for securing all the King's concessions to the Catholics.*]

5. That the Marquis of Ormonde, or any others, shall not disturb the professors of the Roman Catholic Religion in possession of the articles above specified.

6. The Earl of Glamorgan engages his Majesty's word for the performance of those articles.

7. That the public faith of the kingdom shall be engaged to the said Earl, by the Commissioners of the Confederate Catholics, for sending ten thousand men by order and public declaration of the General Assembly at Kilkenny, armed, the one-half with muskets, and the other half with pikes, to serve his Majesty in England, Wales, or Ireland, under the command of the said Earl of Glamorgan, as Lord General of the said army; which army is to be kept together in one entire body; and all others, the officers

and commanders of the said army, are to be named by the Supreme Council of the said Confederate Catholics, or by such others as the General Assembly of the said Confederate Catholics of Ireland shall entrust therewith."*

The Irish Commissioners engaged their word and the faith of the Supreme Council of Kilkenny, that two-thirds of the clergy's revenues should be employed for the space of three years towards the maintenance of the ten thousand men, the other third being reserved for the clergy's subsistence.

The above treaty having been fully agreed to by both parties, Glamorgan added the following protestation on oath:—"I, Edward, Earl of Glamorgan, do protest and swear faithfully to acquaint the King's most excellent Majesty with the proceedings of this kingdom in order to his service, and to the endearment of this nation, and punctual performance of what I have (*as authorised by his Majesty*) obliged myself to see performed; and in default not to permit the army intrusted to my charge to adventure itself, or any considerable part thereof, until conditions from his Majesty, and by his Majesty, be performed."

The General Assembly fearing that the execution of this treaty might meet opposition from Ormonde, made the following order on the 28th of August, 1645:—"The General Assembly order and declare, that their union and oath of association shall remain firm and inviolable, and in full strength in all points, and to all purposes, until the articles of the intended peace shall be ratified in Parliament, notwithstanding any proclamation of the peace," &c.†

The Nuncio entered the bay of Kenmare, and "touched land," as he says, on the 21st and 22nd of October, 1645 (new style), and made his way to Limerick through many difficulties, as he informed Cardinal Pamphili, to whom he wrote from that city on the 25th. After a few days' stay there, he proceeded to Kilkenny, where he applied himself with much diligence to the study of the "Irish Question" of that day, which he fondly hoped it would be his good fortune to settle happily and permanently. Having made himself well acquainted with the proceedings of the Supreme Council and the Earl of Glamorgan, as also with the general posture of affairs, he delivered his views in a Latin speech to the Council in December, 1645, a copy of which he afterwards gave them. In that document he declared that the Pope's instructions to him embraced two chief points,

* Birch's Inquiry, &c., p. 67.

† Birch's Inquiry, pp. 71-2. Cox. Appendix, p. 117.

namely, to take care that the Irish should maintain an inviolable fidelity, in the first place to God and religion, and in the next to their King; and his opinion was that the best way to secure these two points would be to establish a free exercise of the Catholic religion, and to make peace with their Sovereign. Like Scarampi, he objected to the publication of the political articles of the Treaty without the religious ones, because, by acting thus, it would appear to foreigners that the peace was made on account of private and temporal advantages, and not for the honour and freedom of religion. Besides, it might happen, that when what was considered the opportune time for the publication of the religious articles was come, the King might not be in a position to ratify them. Finally, he urged that should the Earl of Glamorgan in the meantime die, "who could press any further the confirmations of the concessions, or explain the whole course of the negociation?" His conclusion, therefore was, that the political and religious articles should be either published together, or that both should be suppressed until the King had confirmed them.*

But a new and most unexpected turn was given to affairs. The secret agreement between Glamorgan and the Supreme Council, which was meant to be kept perfectly private, was brought to light by the death of the Archbishop of Tuam, at Sligo, on the 25th of October, 1645. He was slain by the Scotch who then held Sligo; and a copy of the document, with other important papers, was found in his baggage. He had been consecrated in 1630 by the Archbishop of Cashel, assisted by other prelates, and was a member of the Supreme Council. His name was Malachy Queely. He was well known and much esteemed in Rome, and Rinuccini, on being sent to Ireland, was instructed to place every confidence in him. He, however, never met the Archbishop at all, as he had left Limerick a short time before the Nuncio's arrival there. Soon after the finding of Glamorgan's treaty, it was sent by the Scotch to the English Parliament, by whose order it was printed. They also forwarded copies to the Marquis of Ormonde, and to Lord Digby, who was then in Dublin.

Two Commissioners from the Supreme Council proceeded to Dublin at Digby's request, to inform him as to the state of forwardness the troops were in, that were destined for his Majesty's service in England; Glamorgan, anxious to forward his own part of the business, accompanied those Commissioners. They arrived in Dublin late on Christmas eve, and the first thing Glamorgan did was to wait on Ormonde and express regret that

* *Memoirs*, fol. 1005-1009. Birch, p. 80.

it gave him displeasure, as he was informed, that he, Glamorgan, was to have the command of the ten thousand Catholic soldiers, then being equipped for the King's service in England. The Marquis replied that those reports were without foundation, expressing, at the same time, the highest regard for Glamorgan.*

On St. Stephen's day, when the Council was assembled in Dublin Castle, Lord Digby came before it, charged the Earl of Glamorgan with a suspicion of High Treason, and moved that his person should be secured, as was accordingly done. This motion of Digby's was founded on the treaty between Glamorgan and the Catholics, Digby declaring that any such pretended authority from his Majesty, must have been either "forged or surreptitiously gained." The Lord Lieutenant on this charge, had a warrant made out for Glamorgan's committal to the custody of the Constable of Dublin Castle, "until further direction." "After being deprived of his arms, he was confined so strictly that not even a servant was left to attend him. The gates of the city were quickly shut, and from that hour to this, no one has been permitted to depart thence, except the two deputies from the Supreme Council, who had been invited there by Digby, as I advised you before. To give a colour to this proceeding, the Earl is accused of high treason, and Digby, who perhaps, does not wish to deny being the author of it, told our Commissioners that on the Monday previous to his arrest, a paper had fallen into his hands containing the articles in favour of the Catholic religion, concerted between Glamorgan and this Council since last August, which paper was found by the Scotch in the baggage of the Archbishop of Tuam, killed at the siege of Sligo two months ago, and that the document was signed by the Archbishop of Cashel, who certifies that it agrees with the original. This last assertion is quite true, because the Archbishop of Cashel told me that he drew it up, and gave it to the Archbishop of Tuam by order of the Council, who thought that every ecclesiastic should have a copy, in order to be able to consider it."†

* Birch's Inquiry, p. 89.

† Nuncio's letter to Cardinal Pamphili, January 1st, 1646. *Embassy in Ireland*, Eng. Trans., p. 108.

"The zeal," says Mr. Birch, "which the Lord Digby expressed against the Earl of Glamorgan's proceedings does him great honour, but is ascribed by Vittorio Siri (Vol. 8, p. 50,) to a less reputable motive than his concern for the Protestant religion; viz., a design to supplant the Earl in the command of the Irish troops, and to procure it for himself. And, in fact, such a concern does not appear to be the governing principle of that great, but inconstant and capricious nobleman's conduct: for though he had distinguished himself in 1638 and 1639, as a very able advocate for protestantism, in a controversy by letters with his cousin, Sir Kenelm Digby; yet, after the King's death, he reconciled himself to

When the news of Glamorgan's arrest and imprisonment reached Kilkenny, it created much excitement there. The majority of the members of the Supreme Council were out of town, on account of the Christmas holidays; however enough remained to hold a meeting, and one was accordingly convened. The members present expressed great indignation at the insult offered to the Council, by the imprisonment of their acknowledged General, one too, who was empowered by the King to treat with them. Their first idea was to declare war and attack Dublin at once; but by degrees, when the relations and partisans of Ormonde appeared, they so far calmed the others, that the only resolution taken was to summon the General Council to deliberate about the conditions on which war should be declared, "if it were possible to carry it on." The Nuncio was strongly of opinion that it was the opportune time for attacking Dublin, then so weakly defended and so poorly victualled, that he considered the Leinster army could have little difficulty in getting possession of it; but another difficulty existed which did not perhaps occur to the mind of the Nuncio, namely, that Ormonde was kept informed of everything that transpired in the Council, so that if an attack upon Dublin were resolved upon, he would be sure to make superhuman exertions to defend it. However, Muskerry, and the other Ormondites in the Council, by judicious objections and delays, warded off the threatened danger; and, beyond doubt, an opportunity was lost for striking a blow, that, it may be fairly presumed, would have not only influenced, but changed the whole future of the struggle.*

The attitude of the Council at Kilkenny had its influence in Dublin, so that having endured nearly a month's imprisonment, Glamorgan was set free on the 21st January, heavy bail being taken for his appearance in thirty days, after due notice. The bail consisted for himself in £20,000, and the Earls of Kildare and Clanrickard in £20,000 each.†

the Church of Rome, upon entering into the service of France, and died in the profession of that faith." *Inquiry, &c.*, p. 106. "The Lord Digby was a man of very extraordinary parts, and had as good an education as any man of his age, of any country; he was graceful and beautiful of person; he was of great eloquence and becomingness in discourse, save, that at times, he seemed a little affected. He began as a violent supporter of the Parliament, but in time turned over to the King, over whom he gained much influence. He was immoderately ambitious of glory, but his fatal infirmity was, that he too often thought difficult things very easy." *Clarendon's Rebellion*, Vol. I., pp. 343-4.

* Rinuccini's Embassy in Ireland, p. 110.

† Birch's Inquiry, p. 138. Carte says £30,000 was the amount of bail, but this seems to be an error, as the recognizance of the accused is usually double that of each of his bails.

At the first blush it may seem to cast a doubt on the reality of Glamorgan's powers from the King, that he allowed himself to be regarded as a traitor and thrown into prison, seeing that if he really possessed those powers, he could have at once offered a complete defence for his proceedings by producing them. But the explanation of his silence on this trying occasion is that, if he did so, he feared the King's service would suffer in consequence. And this is the explanation offered by himself in his letter of June 11, 1660, to Clarendon, which he wrote for the purpose of being placed before Charles the II. In it he says: "For his Majesty's better information, through your favour, and by the channel of your Lordship's understanding things rightly, give me leave to acquaint you with one chief key, wherewith to open the secret passages between his late Majesty and myself, in order to his service; which was no other than a real exposing of myself to any expense or difficulty, rather than his just design should not take place; or in taking effect, that his honour should suffer; an effect, you may justly say, relishing more of a passionate and blind affection to his Majesty's service, than of discretion and care of myself. This made me take a resolution, that he should have seemed angry with me at my return out of Ireland, until I had brought him into a posture and power to own his commands, to make good his instructions, and to regard my faithfulness and zeal therein."*

In their answer to the King's message of the 29th of December, 1645, the English Parliament complained that there had been Irish rebels brought over to England and Scotland, and *that there were endeavours to bring over more to both countries*, as also forces "from foreign parts." The above statement, made on the 13th January, when Glamorgan's proceedings and imprisonment must have reached the Parliamentarians, contained such an evident allusion to him, that the King felt it necessary to make a declaration on the subject, which he did, and sent to the Parliament a fortnight afterwards. In that document he avers that Glamorgan having, "without his directions or privity," entered into a treaty with some Commissioners of the Catholic party in Ireland, was arrested upon suspicion of High Treason, and imprisoned by the Lord Lieutenant, at the instance and by the impeachment of Lord Digby. To give satisfaction to the Houses of Parliament, Charles proceeds to lay before them, as he says, "the whole truth of the

* Quoted by Dr. Lingard, History of England, Vol. VIII. App. PPP. p. 305. 6th Ed.

business," which was, "that the Earl of Glamorgan having made offer unto him to *raise forces in the kingdom of Ireland, and to conduct them into England for his Majesty's service, had a commission to that purpose and to that purpose only.* That he had no commission at all to treat of anything else without the privity and directions of the Lord Lieutenant, much less to capitulate anything concerning religion, or any property belonging either to church or laity. That it clearly appears by the Lord Lieutenant's proceedings with the said Earl that he had no notice at all of what the said Earl had treated and pretended to have capitulated with the Irish, until by accident it came to his knowledge. And his Majesty doth protest, that until that time, as he had advertisement, that the person of the said Earl of Glamorgan was arrested and restrained, as is above said, he never heard or had any notice that the said Earl had entered into any kind of treaty or capitulation with those Irish Commissioners, much less that he concluded or signed those articles so destructive both to Church and State, and so repugnant to his Majesty's public professions and known resolutions. And for the further vindication of his Majesty's honour and integrity herein, he doth declare that he is so far from considering anything contained in those papers and writings, framed by the said Earl, and those Commissioners with whom he treated, as he *doth absolutely disavow him therein,* and hath given commandment to the Lord Lieutenant and the Council, as one, who either out of falseness, presumption, or folly, hath so hazarded the blemishing of his Majesty's reputation with his good subjects, and so impertinently framed those articles of his own head without the consent, privity, or directions of his Majesty, or the said Lord Lieutenant, or any of his Majesty's Council there. But true it is, that for the necessary preservation of his Majesty's protestant subjects in Ireland, whose case was daily represented unto him to be so desperate, he had given leave to the Lord Lieutenant to treat and conclude such a peace there, as might be for the safety of that crown, the preservation of the Protestant religion, and no way derogatory to his own honour and public professions."*

Nittorio Siri says with regard to the above, "that the King thundered against the Earl in this Declaration *only in appearance,* that he might be thought not to have been privy to the concessions made by the Earl in his name to the Irish Catholics."† And this seems to have been the opinion of the Parliament

* Rushworth, Part IV., Vol. I., p. 222. Birch's Inquiry, p. 118.

† Vol. 8, p. 51. Birch, p. 121.

General, Sir Thomas Fairfax, who, writing to Lord Hopton, one of the King's generals, then shut up in Truro, says: "That the Parliament have had clear and certain discoveries that his Majesty...was and is labouring by agents in all parts to *draw in foreign forces*, and especially that the Earl of Glamorgan, by commission from his Majesty, had concluded a peace with the Irish rebels on terms extremely dishonourable and prejudicial, upon the only condition of sending over force under the command of that Lord to invade England, whereof I presume you cannot but have heard. And though his Majesty did, in a letter to the Parliament, *disavow* any such agreement, and *pretended* he had given order to the Lord Digby for the attainting and impeaching the Earl of Glamorgan of High Treason for what he had done therein; yet *by late discoveries* to the Parliament, and especially by letters intercepted the other day at Padstow from the Lord Digby, the Earl of Glamorgan, and others to Secretary Nicholas, yourself, Sir Edward Hyde, the Lord Colepepper, and others, it is most clear and evident that the arresting of the Earl of Glamorgan was *only for a present colour to salve reputation with the people, and continue their delusion*, till designs were ripe for execution; for the same peace is fully concluded with the rebels, the King to have the aid conditioned upon the same agreement, and the Earl of Glamorgan at liberty again, and to command that force."*

The discovery of letters at Padstow was as strange and important as that made in the baggage of the Archbishop of Tuam at Sligo. It happened in this way: Cornwall was favourable to the King, and a ship from Ireland sailed into Padstow, in that county, not doubting but it would be well received; but the reverse was the case; and the people of the town, with the help of some Parliament dragoons, boarded and seized her, putting most of her crew to the sword. The life of the captain, one Allen of Waterford, was spared for the purpose of using such confession as could be extorted from him. The packet of letters which he carried was thrown over board, but was found floating in the water and carried to General Fairfax. They were immediately printed and circulated amongst the people under the title of "The Earl of Glamorgan's negotiations and colourable commitment in Ireland, demonstrated; or, the Irish PLOT for bringing 10,000 men and arms into England..... discovered in several letters," &c. This publication made a great impression on the people of the surrounding district, because "the very thought of Irish and French was hateful to

* Fairfax's letter to Lord Hopton, 9th March, 1646. See Birch, pp. 122-3.

them." Some of the most important letters got detached from the packet and were lost in the water, but the contents of them were substantially supplied by Allen's confession.*

It is not easy to determine how far Ormonde was cognizant of Glamorgan's commission to the Catholics before the treaty with them was discovered, as related above, and a copy of it transmitted to him; but that he had a correct general idea of its chief provisions cannot be doubted. After Digby's defeat at Sherboone, he made his way to Ormonde by the Isle of Man;† but whether or not he had any private instructions for him does not appear. It would seem he had not, as he had no opportunity of seeing the King after the troops defeated at Sherboone had disbanded. But it must be borne in mind that Digby was at Oxford in April, 1644, when Lord Muskerry, Nicholas Plunket, and other agents of the Irish Catholics were there attending on the King, at which time his Majesty gave Glamorgan the great patent conferring a number of titles on him, terminating with Duke of Somerset. He made him generalissimo of three armies—English, Irish, and Foregin,—and admiral of a fleet at sea, promising, moreover, to his son, Plantagenet, his daughter, Elizabeth, in marriage, with a dowry of £300,000. It would be absurd to think that Digby, the King's favourite minister, could be ignorant of such a document, even though he might not have official cognizance of it; and it would be equally absurd to suppose that he would not communicate such knowledge to Ormonde during his sojourn at Dublin Castle.

Besides, it is probable that Ormonde would have some intimation of his commission from Glamorgan himself, for in the King's letter recommending him to Ormonde he says, "I have thought good to use the power I have, both in his [Glamorgan's] affection and duty, to engage him *in all possible ways* to further the peace there, which he hath promised to do. Wherefore, as you find occasion, you may confidently use and trust him in this, *or any other thing he shall propound to you* for my service, there being none in whose honesty and zeal to my person and crown I have more confidence."‡ The obvious meaning of this letter is, that Glamorgan and Ormonde were to consult as to the best means of securing a peace with the Irish Catholics, for which Charles was so exceedingly anxious; but

* Husband's Collection, p. 812.

† Clarendon's Rebellion, Vol. III., p. 718. Oxford Ed., 1707.

‡ Carte, Vol. II., App. No. 13, p. 5. Birch, p. 17. Charles added a characteristic postscript in cypher to this letter, namely, "His honesty or affection to my service will not deceive you, but I will not answer for his judgment." This letter is dated Oxford, 27th December, 1644.

there could not be a real, useful consultation between them unless Glamorgan at least outlined to Ormonde the powers with which he was entrusted. Even admitting that he did not do so, which is very unlikely, his every move in Kilkenny would be accurately reported to Ormonde by his brother-in-law, Lord Muskerry, and his other friends and creatures in the Supreme Council.*

In a letter dated 12th of March, written to Glamorgan by the King, he says he is surprised that that nobleman had not already taken his departure for Ireland, and expressing the greatest confidence in his integrity, proceeds:—"Commanding you to deal with all ingenuity and freedom with our Lieutenant of Ireland, the Marquis of Ormonde, and on the word of a King and a Christian, I will make good anything which our Lieutenant shall be induced unto, upon your persuasion; and if you find it fitting, you may privately show him these, which I intend as obligatory to him, but to myself, and for both your encouragements and warrantise, in whom I repose my chiefest hopes, not having in all my kingdoms two such subjects; whose endeavours joining, I am confident, to be soon drawn out of the mire I am enforced to wallow in."†

There are many other documents and circumstances connected with Glamorgan's mission to Ireland which need not be gone into here. From what has been said above it is hard to come to any other conclusion but that Digby and Ormonde were merely acting a part in impeaching and committing him. And this is the opinion of that shrewd and impartial investigator, Dr. Lingard, who says:—"That he [Glamorgan] communicated the substance of his instructions to Ormonde cannot be doubted; and if there were aught in his subsequent proceedings of which the Lord Lieutenant remained ignorant, that ignorance was affected and voluntary on the part of Ormonde."‡

* "This man [Digby] who was the only antagonist of the Earl of Glamorgan, left no stone unmoved to hinder his proceedings with the Catholics, and that on purpose, went now and then to Kilkenny to infuse those things into the ears of such as he knew were to embrace the same, as instructed in Dublin. This man, Taaffe and Castellagh, as postillions to and fro betwixt Dublin and Kilkenny had no repose, all the intelligence and secret intentions of the Irish Council and State was, by those Mercuries, intimated to Ormonde." *Aphorismical Discovery*, Vol. I., p. 99.

† *Century of Inventions*, p. XXXVIII. Quoted by Dr. Lingard, Vol. VIII. of his *History of England*: Appendix PPP. p. 307. Dr. Lingard surmises that "these" [writings] which Glamorgan might show to Ormonde consisted of the King's Warrant to him to treat with the Catholics, which was dated at Oxford the same day as the letter.

‡ *History of England*, Vol. VIII., p. 58. 6th Ed.

When Glamorgan returned to Kilkenny, he laboured as strenuously as ever to promote the King's interests, but he found the Supreme Council much divided. The Ormondites, and all whom they could influence, were most impatient for a peace, setting more value on the civil than on the religious conditions.* They began to publish the terms of the Peace, in order to influence the General Assembly, when it met; and they even attempted to prevent it from meeting at all. But failing in this they resorted to "the most under-hand practices to secure the election to the General Assembly of those who belonged to their faction."† At this time news came to the Nuncio that a treaty had been agreed upon at Rome between His Holiness and Sir Kenelm Digby, the Queen's resident minister there, which caused the Nuncio to ask for a delay in their proceedings until the original of the treaty should come to his hands; as he had been supplied with only a copy in the first instance. Instead of this request being acceded to, two Commissioners were at once despatched to Dublin "to put the last stroke to the negotiations with Ormonde." Under these circumstances, the Nuncio convoked an assembly of all the bishops and vicars representing the clergy, and with their assistance and approval drew up a protest against assenting to any other peace than that subscribed in Rome.‡ He even succeeded in persuading Glamorgan to accept the Roman Treaty, and withdraw his own.§ The reasons put forward for this course by the Nuncio were:—

1. Because the Roman Treaty secured, as far as could be done, the greatest possible security for the free exercise of the Catholic Religion, for which he, Glamorgan, could only give an uncertain promise.
2. As the Earl professed fidelity to his king and country, he ought to uphold the Roman Peace, because

* "Next to the insecurity of their estates, there was no grievance which before the troubles so much affected the Roman Catholics of Ireland as their utter incapacity for preferment, and the exclusion of them from all places of honour and trust. The Marquis of Ormonde was satisfied that it was this grievance which disposed them most effectually to take up arms, and was persuaded that unless it were in some measure removed, it would be the point on which they would break in a treaty of Peace; though in such case, they would (as they had done in the other [treaty of Peace]) impute the breach to want of satisfaction in matter of religion, which was the only motive that weighed with the people." Carte's *Life of Ormonde*, Vol. I., p. 483.

† Nuncio's Letter to Cardinal Pamphili, from Kilkenny, 13th Feb., 1646.

‡ Ibid, p. 117. Lord Digby declared in Dublin that "the Protestants would rather throw the king out of the window than permit his Majesty to confirm the concessions promised by Glamorgan."—*Ib.* 120.

§ The Nuncio was not, at the time, aware that the king had repudiated Glamorgan's Treaty.

it gave the same aid in soldiers as was promised by his own Peace, and "an annual sum of money, with the exercise of the Catholic Religion in England as well as in Ireland;" two things which he, Glamorgan, could never promise.* 3. Then, by the Roman Peace, he would lose none of his rights or prerogatives, whilst he would be relieved from great responsibilities, and be confirmed in the command of the Irish army, the Nuncio, having the power of doing so. 4. Because the acceptance of his, Glamorgan's peace, after the Pontifical Articles had been declared, would be a virtual refusal of them, and would be so great a disrespect to the person of the Pontiff, and to the Supremacy of the Holy See, as would oblige his Holiness to testify his displeasure by the removal of the Papal ministers from Ireland, and would excite the disgust of all the other Sovereigns.†

Moved, we must presume, by these considerations, Glamorgan supported the Nuncio in standing out for the Pontifical Treaty; but as the original of that Treaty had not arrived, some went so far as to say the Queen did not fully approve of it. It is very likely her Majesty hesitated before she consented to the conditions it contained. At last she, upon hearing of the distress of his Majesty's affairs, by the loss of the battle of Naseby, consented to the conditions.‡ It seems to have been a mere reckless concession of hers under the circumstances, and was quite useless to the Catholics, because even if accepted at home there was no power to enforce it.

The General Assembly met at Kilkenny, and after four days' discussion unanimously agreed to accept the peace settled by their Commissioners with Ormonde in Dublin, which they did on the 28th of March, 1646, notwithstanding the Nuncio's opposition. It was, like other treaties with the Catholics, accompanied by a conditional obligation, that the king would be disengaged from all his concessions, unless those succours

* The second Article of the Roman Treaty was "that he [the king] do annul and repeal all the penal laws, and others whatsoever, made against the Catholics on account of their religion, from the beginning of the defection of Henry VIII. to this day." The 8th Article is that the king "do repeal all the laws made against the Catholics of England, and particularly the two oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance." By the 9th and 10th Articles it is settled "that an agreement is to be made between the king and the Supreme Council of Ireland, to transport into England an army of 12,000 foot." For the maintenance of this army the Pope undertakes to pay the first year 100,000 crowns of Roman money, by monthly instalments, which is to be continued the second and third year "as the forces shall stand, and according to the advantage that shall be made by the said army."—See full text of Treaty in Birch, p. 143.

† Embassy in Ireland, 120-1.

‡ Birch, p. 143.

were obtained, which were the great purpose and final object of his negotiations with the Irish.* This Treaty contains thirty articles, and is so voluminous that not even an epitome of it can be inserted here, covering, as it does, about thirteen closely printed pages in the histories which give it. There was nothing stipulated in it with regard to religion, but that the Catholics should be exempted from taking the oath of Supremacy, on swearing allegiance according to a new form.† With respect to the question of the independence of the Irish Parliament of that of England, a new concession was made to the Confederate Catholics. Instead of referring the matter to *both Legislatures* (i.e., of England and Ireland), as was formerly proposed, it was now "accorded and agreed that his Majesty will leave *both Houses of Parliament in this kingdom* [Ireland], to make such declaration therein as shall be agreeable to the laws of the kingdom of Ireland."

* Leland's Ireland, Vol. III., p. 280. 4to Ed.

† "It is further concluded, accorded and agreed, by and between the said parties, that for all matters concerning the first proposition of the said Catholics, viz.: 'That all acts made against the professors of the Roman Catholic faith, whereby any restraint, penalty, mulct, or incapacity, may be laid upon any Roman Catholic within the kingdom of Ireland, may be repealed, and the said Catholics to be allowed the freedom of the Roman Catholic religion;' that *His Majesty's said Roman Catholic subjects be referred to His Majesty's gracious favour and further concessions.*"—Article I.

CHAPTER XV.

THE Peace spoken of above was called "the Peace of forty-six." [1646]. Although signed and sealed on the 28th of March, from various causes it was not published till the 29th of July. The Nuncio was against its publication, because he was expecting the original of another Peace agreed to at Rome, and to be brought over by the Queen's agent there, Sir Kenelm Digby: it was even surmised that Ormonde himself was not very anxious to publish the Peace, as the English Parliament and the Scots were against any terms being made with the Irish papists, whom they had doomed to extermination, after which their lands were to pass to God's Elect, namely, the said exterminators. Ormonde, who knew the King's affairs grew every day more desperate, saw he must, before long, come to terms either with the Parliamentarians or the Confederates, and as his leanings were decidedly to the former, his policy was to do nothing that would give them offence.

The Peace was published with great solemnity, first in Dublin, and next in Kilkenny, the city of the Confederation itself; but as it was also the city of the Butlers, Ormonde's power was great there, exclusive of his strong and numerous party in the Supreme Council.* Billings says the Peace was published in Kilkenny to "the great joy of all good people;"† but this assertion is not borne out by the reception accorded to it in Limerick and other places, where we may assume there were also some good people. No doubt, many were anxious for peace, and on hearing that the accredited Commissioners of the Catholics had made one with Ormonde, would suppose it to be a favourable peace, and so experience a feeling of relief and satisfaction. But the fact was that very few people knew the exact terms of the Peace at the time it was published. So true is this that when, in the earlier days of August, the Nuncio called the prelates together

* Nothing can show Ormonde's power in the Supreme Council more clearly than the fact, that out of the seven Commissioners deputed to conclude the Treaty of Peace with him, six at least were of his party, or his "faction," as his opponents called them. They were:—Lord Viscount Mountgarret, Lord Viscount Muskerry, Sir Robert Talbot, Dermot O'Brien, Patrick Darcy, Geoffrey Browne, and John Dillon.

† "*Magna bonorum lætitiâ.*" *Vindiciæ*, &c., p. 32.

for the holding of a Council at Waterford, most of them had not seen the Treaty of Peace at all, nor, indeed, had the Nuncio himself been favoured with a copy of it.* He, however, at once sent to Kilkenny for one which he submitted to the assembled prelates.

The first thing they did was to discuss the Oath of Association, clause by clause, then the Remonstrance of grievances agreed to at Trim on the 17th of March, 1642, and the other Remonstrances put forward by the Catholics at various times. The propositions contained in these documents embodied the full and complete freedom of the Catholic Church in Ireland, and had been sworn to "by the Confederate Catholics in a General Assembly, to be insisted upon, and obtained *upon any treaty of peace*, otherwise that they would not lay down their arms while they had power and ability to maintain the war."† These propositions so far from having been insisted upon in the Treaty, were not even presented or urged, as the Commissioners of the Treaty themselves admitted; which looks somewhat like a breach of trust on the part of the said Commissioners. But it does not appear that they were *commanded*, before leaving Kilkenny, to present the propositions referred to, when they came to treat with Ormonde; and indeed their instructions must have been of a very elastic kind, if they could change or modify the terms of the Treaty without referring for further instructions to the Supreme Council. The Committee of Treaty afterwards excused themselves by saying that they considered Glamorgan's concessions were contained in the first of the thirty articles of the Treaty.‡ But to put forward such a plea was the merest childishness. They also pleaded in their defence a thing equally silly, which was, that after the treaty was signed "they moved his Excellency regarding Glamorgan's concessions;" but he plainly told them that "he never meant by the article of 'further concessions' that the Catholics should thereby have the benefit of Glamorgan's concessions."§

In these negotiations, it is said by many that the Catholics were contending for concessions which the King could not safely grant, and which if granted he had not the power to fulfil; but it must be borne in mind that when those demands

* The Embassy in Ireland, p. 197.

† Unkind Deserter, Dublin reprint, p. 48.

‡ See the passage at p. 227.

§ Unkind Deserter, p. 50. The Committee of Treaty were condemned in the opinion of "two famous lawyers," as having betrayed their trust with regard to the Treaty. *Ibid.*, p. 53.

were put forward, the belief was that the King *de jure* would one day be King *de facto* again, and so the Catholics wished to have proofs in their hands of what he had bound himself to grant them. The capital error committed by Ormonde, (which was nothing short of a betrayal of his Master's interests,) was, that he did not allow Glamorgan to proceed with his mission to the Catholics, which he right well knew was a true mission from the King ; and the more blameworthy was he, because, as Dr. Leland says, Glamorgan's concessions differed very slightly from those which the King had previously empowered Ormonde himself to grant, but which, with his habitual dislike to concede anything to the Catholics, he took good care to conceal.*

After much and anxious deliberation† on the Peace, the Nuncio, the Prelates, and the other Dignitaries present *unanimously* condemned it in the strongest terms; declaring that "any of the Confederate Catholics who would adhere to it or consent to be supporters of it, or in any other way embrace it, should be absolutely regarded as perjured, especially for this reason, that in those articles no mention is made of the Catholic Religion, and the security of it, nor any care had for the preservation of the privileges of the country, as is found promised in the oath."‡ The Assembly further declared that they had not given and would not give their consent to such peace, unless secure conditions were added, *for religion, for the King, and for the country*, according to the oath taken by the Confederates. The decree having been signed and sealed was translated both into English and Irish, and sent for publication throughout the country. The question of excommunicating such as adhered to

* "Nor could Ormonde seriously believe that the King was incapable of granting such a commission as Glamorgan pleaded, or of ratifying his transactions with the Irish, when he considered the extent of those powers he, himself, had received from his Majesty." *Hist. of Ireland*, Vol. III., p. 268, 4to Ed. Again : "The articles of this treaty [Glamorgan's] scarcely amounted to anything more than Ormonde had himself been empowered to grant." *Ibid.*, p. 270.

† "*Per multos dies exagitata.*" *Decree against the Peace*. "This Decree was signed at Waterford on the 12th of August, 1648, by the Nuncio, the Archbishops of Dublin and Cashel, and ten other bishops ; the Procurator of the Primate, the Vicars Apostolic of Tuam, Ross and Emly, eight Vicars General, five Abbots, and five other representatives of the Regular Orders." See *Unkind Deserter*, p. 58, and *Cox*, Appendix xxx, p. 122.

‡ "*Omnes et singuli Confœderati Catholici, qui simili paci adhærebunt, vel ejus fautoribus consentient, aut alio modo illam amplectentur, perjuri absolutè habendi sint, eâ præcipuè de causâ, quod in iis articulis nulla facta est mentio Catholicæ Religionis, ejusque securitatis, nec ulla habita ratio conservationis privilegiorum Patriæ, sicuti juramento legitur promissum.*" *Unkind Deserter*, pp. 58, 59.

the Peace after it was condemned was discussed, but action upon that matter was postponed to a future session.*

Between the signing of the Peace and the publishing of it, a most important event occurred in Ulster; the battle of Benburb was fought and won by Owen O'Neill on the 5th of June. Early in the spring of that year, O'Neill waited on the Nuncio at Kilkenny, and on that occasion the Supreme Council gave him authority to raise a new army, of which he was to have the command, under the title of Captain-General of the Catholic army of Ulster; the Nuncio, at the same time, giving him a sum of money to equip and support it. At this period O'Neill kept his quarters in the southern parts of Ulster, the Scots having grown so powerful, that he felt it was necessary for his security to be near the borders of Leinster. In Spring he removed from those quarters to a hill called Gallanagh, in the county Cavan, where he remained seven weeks training and exercising his men daily, after which he moved towards Charlemont.† It was not without a good deal of hesitation that the Supreme Council gave the chief command in Ulster to O'Neill, but their fear of the Northern Scots, and their belief in O'Neill's consummate military skill, turned the scale in his favour; besides Castlehaven's lamentable failure on a previous occasion in Ulster was still fresh in their memories.‡ Nor were the fears of the Supreme Council groundless. Monroe, who was Commander-in-Chief for the Parliament in Ulster, having obtained the approbation of Montgomery, Lord of Ards, Lord Blaney, and the leading officers of the *English* army there, had taken the resolution of marching on Kilkenny, encouraged by the fact that the Leinster forces of the Confederates had been sent as auxiliaries into Munster and Connaught. No obstruction lay in the way of the success of

* Ibid., p. 60. In Dr. Curry's *Civil Wars* it is asserted that the Nuncio and the Prelates, who were assembled on this occasion, issued an excommunication against all who would adhere to the Peace. Whether this statement comes from Dr. Curry himself, or from his Gallican editor, Dr. O'Connor, I know not, but it is quite devoid of foundation. See *History of Civil Wars, Vol. I., p. 357.*

† There is a station on the railway between Mullingar and Cavan, called Ballywillan, by which this district may be reached. Almost without human habitation even now, it must have been in Owen Roe's time, a most secluded out-of-the-way place. It is studded with small lakes, and in the hands of a man of his strategical ability, could be made, and no doubt was made, for the time being, strong and defensible.

‡ "Considering with themselves how the Lord Castlehaven lost many of his army, and did nothing but stole away from the Scottish at last, they resolved to employ McArt [O'Neill] and so styled him Captain-General of the Catholic army of Ulster, with permission to raise seven regiments [of foot] and seven troops of horse—which accordingly he did." *History of the War in Ireland, from 1641 to 1653.* By a British Officer of the regiment of Sir John Clottworthy, p. 43.

this design, but O'Neill and his newly raised levies. The Scots and English, however, made but small account of these, and their chief fear was, lest O'Neill, by some clever movement, might escape out of their hands, take possession of the fastness of Cshawbeogh, and, for a time, at least, retard their advance. In a council of war held in O'Neill's camp, it was debated whether they should allow Monroe to pass into Leinster, spoil Ulster in his absence, and meet and fight him on his return; or whether it would not be better policy to fight him at once, and prevent his advance. The latter course was resolved upon, O'Neill himself being for it. Informed by his scouts that Monroe was near, he moved forward about an English mile from his camp, and disposed his men in order of battle. To the south he leaned on the river Blackwater, from the banks of which there opened a spacious plain towards the West, from which point the Scotch were approaching; on the North there was a hill of no great elevation, with some useful ditches. This hill was seized and occupied for Monroe, before the Irish had time to reach it. On the East, and generally through the grounds where O'Neill's army was drawn up there were shrubs and steep hillocks, "with a mixture of even vallies."*

In the earlier part of the day there was a good deal of manœuvring, and some smart skirmishes, in which the Irish soldiers generally had the best of it. The general engagement did not begin until four o'clock in the afternoon. The rough shrubby ground in O'Neill's front, and around him, would have been very advantageous to him had the enemy advanced, but they kept their ground, for a considerable time employing their ordnance only, with which they opened fire as soon as they had gained the hill opposite to O'Neill. The order of battle at both sides was pretty much alike. "The Scotch foot was cast into nine divisions; five made up the front, and the four which were to second them at some little distance behind, but so little space had been left to receive them in case there should be need of their assistance in the front, and themselves, moreover, were joined so close that the rear must have compassed all the front before they could be drawn up to fight; and the front upon any accident which might befall them, being compelled to retreat, must have disordered the rear; and this was believed

* A Journal of the most memorable transactions of General Owen O'Neill, and his party, from the year 1641 to the year 1650, faithfully related by Colonel Henry McTully O'Neill, who served under him. This Journal is printed in the second volume of the "*Desiderata Curiosa Hibernica*." "He [O'Neill] marched a mile from Benburb towards, where he took his ground on a scrogged high hill." *Officer of Sir J. Clotworthy's Regiment*, p. 46.

to have contributed very much to the loss of that battle. The Irish foot were likewise disposed into seven divisions, whereof four made up the front, and three the rear; and so much space was left between each division in the front as might conveniently receive the bodies placed behind, which standing at some distance right against the empty spaces, might by marching directly forward fill up the empty room, and come to fight without enlarging the front; the horse on both sides winged the armies, and the Scotch cannon played from the front, which stood upon the declining of an easy hill between both armies."*

The Nuncio had appointed a certain Father Egan, a Franciscan Friar, to be Chaplain-General to O'Neill's army. Under his guidance they prepared for the coming conflict by religious exercises, after which O'Neill addressed them in a short, spirit-stirring speech, in which he told them they were in the first place going to fight for the religion delivered to their ancestors by St. Patrick, and in the next for their dear native land—now made a land of desolation. After addressing them, O'Neill ordered his troops to advance, a command which they cheerfully obeyed, for they had grown impatient under a delay of several hours, which O'Neill deemed necessary to his strategy. All officers were ordered to go in front of their men, and that "fire was not to be given" until they were within pike's length of the enemy.

All the contemporary accounts of the battle agree that Monroe had both sun and wind in his favour. Carte says that "O'Neill amused the enemy for four hours with little skirmishes, and firing at a distance, till he had got the sun on his back, which before was favourable to the Scots, and the detachment he expected had joined him."† But it is quite certain that he could not have got the sun "on his back," without turning nearly right about to the east, which it is needless to say he could not think of doing under the circumstances. Hence, according to a better, because a contemporary authority, the sun was not on O'Neill's back when his men made the decisive charge. When he ordered them forward he told them "not to give fire until they were within pike's length; which accordingly was done. *At this time the sun and wind was against them, and blew the smoke in their faces, so that for a little*

* *Fragmentum Historicum*, by Richard Billings, Esq. [afterwards Sir Richard], p. 344, Vol. II. of the *Desiderata Curiosa Hibernica*.

† *Life of Ormonde*, Vol. I., p. 576.

moment the musketeers could not see."* Sir Richard Billings, who was probably present at the battle, asserts the same fact in these words:—"The sun and wind favoured the Scots, which was an advantage the Irish could not contend for without leaving the defence of their camp, and exposing the baggage for a prey to the enemy."†

As has been already observed, the two armies had been face to face from a pretty early hour; Monroe was on the ground first, and had secured a hill to the north of the battlefield before O'Neill could reach and occupy it, as he was desirous to do. This vantage ground Monroe was determined to hold, and from it O'Neill vainly tried to induce him to descend and give battle. Many contemporary authors, some of whom were present, say the battle began about 4 o'clock, p.m., but all admit that O'Neill's decisive charge did not commence before 8, and this fact will, to a great extent, account for the apparent contradictory statements as to the sun being in favour of the Scots, as some say, or in favour of the Irish, as others assert. At 4 o'clock the Scots would be favourably placed in this respect; at 8, and later, it would be somewhat in favour of the Irish. The battle was fought at the junction of the River Oona with the Blackwater.

The only person who says O'Neill remedied, or at least made an effort to remedy, this great disadvantage, is the Author of the *Aphorismical Discovery*, who, no doubt, was present in O'Neill's suite. He says:—"When Munroe placed his foot and his field pieces in a place of advantage, both wind and sun were shining and blowing in his back, and in the very face of the Irish," but, he adds, "the Catholic General . . . used his very best endeavours to have the wind and sun in his back, and turn it to his enemy's face, though at the instant in actual possession, which by his dexterity was brought to pass, being an extraordinary advantage on such an occasion."‡ It is a great pity this Author did not explain to us how this change was effected, for it is hard to understand or reconcile it with Sir R. Billings's words quoted above. The only probable conjecture one can make is, that O'Neill, steadily and imperceptibly kept shifting westward, which would enable

* English Officer of Sir J. Clottworthy's regiment, p. 48. This regiment was not in the fight: "Our regiment of Antrim," says the English officer, "not being there, being quartered between Antrim and the fort of Blackwater, at the river foot."—*Ibid.*, p. 50.

† *Fragmenta Historica*, p. 346.

‡ *Aphorismical Discovery*, pp. 113, 114.

him to keep turning his face by degrees more northward, and so avoid at least the direct action of the evening sun.

The battle having continued "with equal order and earnestness for two hours, all hands were drawn to be engaged, the divisions in the rear of the Irish army filled up with ease the void spaces allotted them to fight in, and those placed behind in the Scotch army struggling for room among their fellows in the front, who were already too thick set, which when General O'Neill observed, he gave order, his men still keeping their order, should come up to them, and try the matter with sword and pike; against which impression, and the confusion which still grew greater between their own party by reason of the throng, the Scots made no long resistance, but being broken and routed they sought safety by flight. The wings where the horse fought with various fortune, seeing the gross of their men defeated, fled likewise, and many of them found benefit by the approach of night, and the swiftness of their horses; though the Irish General, as soon as he saw them broken, called aloud to his horse to pursue them, and leave the foot to follow the execution of the infantry, which held on untill ten of the clock with great slaughter; and this was the success of the battle of Benburb, fought the 5th of June, in the year 1646, wherein the Scotch lost their artillery, their colours, and baggage. The Lord Blaney was killed, and the Lord Montgomery, who commanded the horse, with sundry other officers, was made prisoners."* Lord Blaney was killed because he refused to take quarter, and so died fighting where he stood. The English troops commanded by him stood by him to the last, and were nearly all cut off. Montgomery's horse were much blamed for their conduct, for as soon as they saw their Commander made prisoner, they turned and fled.

Monroe's loss at Benburb was very great. The English officer of Clotworthy's regiment says, "the number killed there was about eighteen or nineteen hundred, besides one hundred and fifty odd taken prisoners of private soldiers. The officers who got quarters he sent to Charlemont, but the Lord of Ardes he sent to Cloghouter."† The Nuncio's account, which may be regarded as O'Neill's own account, says:—"More killed on the field [meaning the enemy] have been counted to the number of 3,243: it is impossible to know how many were killed in flight."‡

* *Fragmenta Historica*, p. 346.

† *History of the Warr in Ireland*, p. 51.

‡ *Embassy in Ireland*, p. 174. Monroe, in the account of the battle which he sent to the English Parliament, writes:—"We lost of foot at the nearest

As happens with regard to most battles, the precise numbers engaged at either side in the battle of Benburb cannot be very accurately determined. The effective strength of O'Neill's forces must have been about 5,000—rather under than over that number. He had obtained permission from the Supreme Council to enlist 5,000 Ulster men, which he did, five hundred of them being horse “such as they were.”* The Nuncio says O'Neill's forces were under 5,000; and as he had received by Father Egan an account of the battle from Owen Roe himself, this number may be taken as substantially correct.† The English Officer of Clottworthy's regiment calculates Monroe's numbers to have been 3,000 Scotch and 2,000 British soldiers, “besides seven or eight hundred horse, or thereabouts.” In such facts as fell under the observation of this British Officer, he seems to be a fairly conscientious authority; still he would be likely to minimize Monroe's forces as he has minimized his losses. What must be accepted in the case as beyond doubt is, that Monroe had at least 1,000 men more than O'Neill at Benburb—a very serious difference in such small armies, especially as Monroe was greatly superior to O'Neill in cavalry.‡

conjecture five or six hundred, and twenty officers were taken prisoners, the Lord of Ardes being one.” Whilst this was Monroe's account, there was published in a few days, either by the Parliament, or in its interest, an Account of “A bloody fight at Blackwater in Ireland, where almost 5,000 Protestants were put to the sword by the rebels. . . . London: Printed by Jane Coe, June the 15, 1646.” And there is therein given “A List of that bloody fight at Blackwater in Ireland, June the 5, 1646, by the Irish rebels against Major-General Monro.”

7 pieces of ordnance taken, 2 of them small.

5,000 armes, all they had almost.

4,000 foot, and upward, killed, taken, and routed.

600 horse routed: some killed and taken.

Lord Mount-gomery, Lord Ardes killed or taken.

Lord Blaney, sore wounded, and taken, and dead.

Almost all the foot officers and soldiers put to the sword.

—*Aphorismical Discovery*, Vol. I., p. 679.

* *O'Neill's Journal*.

† “The General [O'Neill] did send his dispatches by Father Boetius Egan and a troop of horse, to my Lord Nuncio and Supreme Councell. resident then in Limbricke, 31 colours, one standart, a note of the battle succienctly of both friends and foe's proceedinge.”—*Aphorismical Discovery*, Vol. I., p. 679.

‡ Carte gives the number of Monroe's forces as 6,000 foot and 800 horse, whilst he says O'Neill's army consisted of “near 5,000 foot and 500 horse.”—*Life of Ormonde*, Vol. I., p. 575.

Benburb or Binburb, where the battle above described was fought, is in the parish of Clonfeacle, barony of Dungannon, and county of Tyrone. “The hill top which was the centre of the Irish position, lies at the following distances from surrounding places of note—distances being English miles in a straight line from each place named: from the old Castle of Dungannon, 6½ miles southward; from the great new cathedral of St. Patrick, Armagh, 7 miles

Knowingly or unknowingly, Carte makes a grave misstatement, when he says that, at the end of May, O'Neill advanced towards Armagh, and that Monroe drew out his forces to oppose him. O'Neill did march towards Armagh, but if he did, it was to oppose, and if possible prevent Monroe's advance on Kilkenny, as has been already stated, and as is attested by the best contemporary authorities, from which I make the following brief quotations:—"Towards the end of seven weeks [which was towards the end of May] O'Neill got intelligence from Charlemont, that the British and Scottish army were to rendezvous at a place called Benburb, within two miles of Charlemont, on the *fifth* of June; *on which he marched towards it*, discharging all the [creachts], and ordering them to return home; and come in the evening before the day to Benburb."* Lord Montgomery, as already stated, was made prisoner, "among whose papers a note was found of the lists of the army in their way to Kilkenny, where they meant to be in twelve days' march."† The author of the *Aphorismical Discovery* gives the details of this document, thus: "The battle given, Montgomery's pocketts examined, a list of each day's marche was found therein; coming to the county [they] were to lodge in the very towne of Cavan, next night to Fyena [Finnea], from thence to Mollingare, to Tyrrell's Pass, to Geyssill [Geashill], to Maryboroughe, to Ballinakill, to Kilkenny, where Ormonde and Inchiquin were to meet the enemy with their several parties. Sir John Gifford was to meet them at Geyssill, with as many men as he could, and the Puritans of Leix likewise at Maryboroughe. All this did the said papers set forth." . . . ‡ And Colonel McCully O'Neill solemnly writes,

northward; from Caledon, 4½ miles northward; from Moy and Charlemont, 4½ miles south-westward, and from the ancient Castle of Benburb, 2½ miles westward." *The Battle of Benburb. By an Ulster Archæologist.* See Transactions of Ossory Archæological Society, Vol. I., p. 307. The Archæologist is Mr. Henry Tohall, of Moy, whose account of the battle is the fullest and best I have met with, and is moreover, illustrated by an accurate map of the battlefield, with every spot of which Mr. Tohall is as familiar as he is with the streets of his native town. Sometime ago I had the rare advantage of examining this famous spot, under Mr. Tohall's guidance.

* British Officer's "Warr in Ireland," p. 44. Carte and others who follow him, say O'Neill's army consisted of nothing but Creachts, but if such were the case, he would have no army at all if he sent away all his creachts. Creachts were nomads who drove their cattle from place to place, in order to get pasturage for them; there can be little doubt but many of these enlisted in O'Neill's army, whilst it is equally certain that many, who did not enlist, accompanied it as camp followers or sutlers. These he would be sure to dismiss on the eve of a battle, as a dangerous incumbrance likely to cause confusion.

† Billings' *Fragmenta, in Desiderata Curiosa Hibernica*, Vol. II., p. 347.

‡ *Aphorismical Discovery*, Vol. I., p. 117.

"That if God had not put this timely stop to Munroe's career, his instructions and intentions were to harass the whole country before him till he came to Dunmore near Kilkenny, as was found by a memorial delivered by my Lord Mountgomery's own hand when a prisoner."*

Monroe's generalship at the battle of Benburb appears to have been very faulty, and O'Neill, when the battle was won, was much surprised that Monroe had no reserve, while O'Neill himself had a reserve of about one thousand "half a quarter of an English mile out of Monroe's sight, commanded by their Colonel, Rory Maguire, a gallant stout person."† Monroe fled without his coat, or wig, and indeed seemed to have lost his head also, for he rushed furiously to Lisnagarvey, immediately burned Dundrum, deserted Portadown, Clare, Glanevy, Downpatrick and other places, sent for the Laggan forces to his assistance, and ordered the country to rise, every household being to furnish two musketeers."‡ This wild alarm caused such consternation amongst his followers that great numbers fled to Scotland.§

When O'Neill had secured the spoils of the enemy, a great portion of which he sent to Charlemont fort, he proceeded to Tanderagee to rest, and refresh his troops. Whilst there a messenger arrived from the Nuncio to congratulate him on his victory, and to request him to proceed south, where his presence was urgently needed. This request was anything but agreeable to O'Neill, who meant to have followed up his success in Ulster, which he could have readily done, as the overwhelming blow struck at Benburb had utterly demoralized the only formidable army in that Province, and had caused consternation everywhere. But O'Neill, to manifest his obedience to the representative of the Holy See, relinquished his plans, and acceded at once to the wishes of the Nuncio; a proceeding with which both his officers and men were greatly displeased. The motive commonly assigned for the Nuncio calling O'Neill to his aid is, that he wished to prevent the Peace from being accepted, which had been already con-

* *Desiderata Curiosa Hibernica*, Vol. II., p. 505.

† Sir John Clottworthy's English Officer, p. 52.

‡ Carte's *Ormonde*, Vol. I., p. 576. Monroe arrived in Belfast accompanied with only six horsemen. See *A bloody fight, &c.*, in *Aphorism. Discovery*, Vol. I., p. 679.

§ In the above account of the battle of Benburb, I have (as far as possible from contemporary authorities) endeavoured to compose a consecutive narrative of that famous engagement, and the circumstances more immediately connected with it. This was a more difficult task than might seem at first, because the contemporary accounts are very fragmentary, and sometimes differ from each other regarding even important facts.

demned in the Synod of Waterford. Be this as it may, whilst the Marquis of Ormonde, who had entered Kilkenny in great state, was proceeding to Clonmel, he was suddenly made aware that O'Neill was within a day's march of him. This intelligence made him retire with such precipitation, that his return was nothing short of a flight, for, leaving his army behind him, he travelled night and day with a few horsemen, till he reached Dublin, where he arrived on the 13th of September. "He entered the city," says Carte, "the Earl of Castlehaven bearing the sword before him (!) and was welcomed with great acclamations, having reaped no other fruits from his expedition, but to be convinced, as well of the vanity of depending any longer upon the Irish Confederates, as of the necessity of applying elsewhere for succours to oppose the designs of those that governed them."*

Ormonde opened negotiations with the Parliament on his return to Dublin, alleging O'Neill's march to Kilkenny as the cause of it, whereas he had been coquetting with the Covenanters of Ulster and the Parliament long before. He sent the Parliament certain terms on which he undertook to give them up Dublin. They sent over Commissioners to him in November, but they were not provided with replies to any of his terms, and refused to enter into particulars with him. So far from it, they gave him to understand that they had come to have Dublin and the sword of state handed over to them, after which he was expected to retire with all dispatch. Ormonde may have felt humiliated, but he could not be surprised at the high-handed conduct of those commissioners; they were dealing with the Viceroy of that monarch, whose implacable enemies they were, and whose blood they shed not long after. Ormonde well deserved their insolence, and ought to have felt it keenly. He did not yield to their demands just then, but did so soon afterwards.

On the return of the Nuncio and the other prelates from Waterford to Kilkenny, the old Supreme Council was dissolved, and a new one appointed. Carte and others make a great deal

* Life of Ormonde, fol. Ed., Vol. I., p. 583. The latter part of the above quotation contains a most unwarrantable assertion—made too in face of the astounding fact, that the sword was carried before Ormonde, when entering Dublin, by a leading Confederate General, and one, too, whom the Confederates had appointed to the Supreme command in Ulster over O'Neill's head. As to Ormonde no longer relying on the Confederates for succour, the truth is quite the other way; the Confederates, who were not his creatures, could no longer rely upon him. He was always demanding men and money from them, without making any corresponding concession. Had he granted to the Confederate Catholics the privileges the King not only empowered him, but wished him to grant, they would have been fighting for their King under his banner long before he gave up Dublin Castle to the King's enemies.

of this as an unjustifiable and unconstitutional act. In ordinary times, no doubt, it would have been open to criticism; but the Peace having been condemned, it became absolutely necessary to condemn the old Council, the majority of which consisted of Ormonde's blood-relations and creatures—as much devoted to him as his Council at Dublin Castle, and far more dangerous to that religious freedom, the securing of which was the first object of the Confederation. A new Supreme Council was appointed. It consisted of fifteen persons; the three generals of the provincial armies, with one bishop and two laymen from each Province; of this new Council the Nuncio was chosen president.

Unfortunately, the jealousies which existed between the generals marred, at every step, the plans of the Confederates. Castlehaven was the merest tool of Ormonde; Preston, a good Catholic, was unstable; he was Ormonde's great friend, and Clanrickard's as well, and so vacillated constantly between their views and those of the Nuncio and the representatives of the old Irish. Both were jealous of O'Neill for two reasons:—1. Because he represented the wishes of the old Irish, and they were the generals of the Palesmen, or old English; 2. They envied his reputation as a general, and feared, or pretended to fear, that he had views beyond and distinct from fighting for the Catholic Religion. For this latter suspicion no substantial proof was ever adduced. The Nuncio indeed expresses strong suspicions about ambitious designs on the part of O'Neill, but that exalted personage was somewhat too ready to suspect every person who did not come into his views, and obey his orders.*

Castlehaven and Preston seem to me to have brought more misfortunes on the Irish cause than any other two men. The former after having been made General-in-Chief of a fine army over O'Neill's head, had at last to steal back from Ulster without effecting anything; whilst the latter lost another army when O'Neill was absent at Sligo. "During the time General Preston was with his Leinster army within fifteen or sixteen miles to Dublin—being a compleat army, to the number of about five thousand, and the best paid in Ireland,"† Jones was then on the hill of Skreen, but not considering himself strong enough to fight Preston, he sent to General Monk, then at Lisnagarvey, for a thousand foot, and five or six troops of horse, which when he had received, he marched towards Preston, who retired on

* "Report of the Proceedings of Owen O'Neill."—See "Embassy in Ireland," p. 281.

† English Officer of Sir John Clottworthy's Regiment, p. 58.

his approach, having heard that he was reinforced; but being pursued by Jones, he was obliged "to face about and take his ground," which he did at a place called Dungan's Hill, about twenty miles north-west of Dublin, and near Summer Hill.* His ground seems to have been ill chosen, and he was not only defeated, but may be said to have literally lost his army. "General Preston was much blamed for his conduct in losing that army, for had he stayed within Portlester-pass, *as McArt [O'Neill] sent him advice*, till himself would come to him with his army, they had [been] too many for Jones; but he did not, *but thought to do the work himself*, but his fate was otherwise."† "This army being thus lost, then Leinster was in a sad and timorous condition, least to be overrun by Jones's army; upon which McArt was sent for by the Councell of Kilkenny to come to Leinster with his army; which accordingly he did without delay, and encamped within a safe place at Castlejordan where no enemy could force him to fight, but when he found his advantage to come out."‡ This battle, which was fought on the 8th of August, 1647, was the first important one fought by Jones after he had been made Governor of Dublin for the Parliament. The recall of O'Neill from prosecuting the siege of Sligo caused a sad derangement of his plans, for the preparations he made for that important undertaking, which cost much time and labour, all went for nothing; and so provoked were his officers, that some of them, on their return to Kilbeggan, broke out into open mutiny, which had well-nigh ended in a general revolt. Matters having been quieted, O'Neill marched to Castlejordan, where he kept his quarters until the following November.§

The taking of Dublin was long a favourite project with the Nuncio. It was the capital of the kingdom, and the seat of government, and he felt that its possession by the Confederates would give them strength at home, and prestige abroad. When the new Council returned to Kilkenny from Waterford, the

* There were two hills: Dungan's hill and Lynch's Knock (or hill). Preston posted himself on Dungan's hill, and on Jones coming up, he took his position on Lynch's hill, about a mile distant. Jones, in giving an account of the battle to the Committee at Derby House, says, "sun, wind, position, everything favoured Preston;" but in this he differs from most accounts, especially from that of the officer of Sir John Clottworthy's regiment. See Father Meehan's "Confederation of Kilkenny," Appendix, p. 308.

† Ibid., p. 59. More of the mean, petty jealousies against the only man who could have won everything for Ireland.

‡ Ibid., p. 60. Carte gives an account of this battle, but it is written in such an evidently unfair spirit, that I elected to follow the one given by the English officer. See Carte's *Ormonde*, Vol. II., p. 5, fol. edition.

§ O'Neill's Journal, *Desiderata Curiosa Hibernica*, Vol. II., p. 508.

result of their first consultation was a resolve to besiege Dublin. But their action in this matter was much quickened by the news that Ormonde had entered into negotiations with the Parliament Commissioners who had arrived in Dublin. As soon as the attack on the Capital was agreed on, the Council and the Nuncio withdrew from Kilkenny to the Castle of Kilka [Kilkea], in the southern part of the County Kildare, which was then in the possession of Father Robert Nugent, Provincial of the Jesuits, by the grant of the Countess Dowager of Kildare, who had died not long before, and had bequeathed to him for the use of the Society all her goods. Of this property he gave to the Nuncio, by way of loan, to the value of £1,500 in plate, which, together with some monies borrowed from Don Diego de la Torres, resident from the Spanish King, was employed in advancing the expedition against Dublin.* Owen O'Neill and Preston both made a visit to Kilkea during the Nuncio's stay there. Lucan, a place seven miles west of Dublin, was fixed

* Billings in *Fragmenta Historica, Desiderata Cur. Hib.*, Vol. II., p. 385. The Countess of Kildare here referred to was the wife of Gerald, the 14th Earl of Kildare, and daughter of Christopher, the 9th Lord Delvin. Her mother was daughter to the 11th Earl of Kildare, so that a Papal Dispensation had to be obtained for her marriage with her cousin, the 14th Earl. Her husband was believed to have been poisoned at a dinner given to him by the Lord Deputy, Chichester, in Dublin Castle. See p. 68. "She was a great promoter of the rebellion (*sic*) of 1641. She demised Kilkea to the outlawed Jesuits, which they held from 1634 to 1646. *Fitzgerald Families*, by the late Dean Hughes, of Maynooth, a MS. in said College, p. 13. I have inserted *sic*, because I do not accept the word rebellion as a proper designation for the Rising of 1641, which even the English officer of Clottworthy's regiment calls "The Warr of Ireland;" and the impartial investigator of the history of the period will find that the men to whom Ormonde (the king's representative in Ireland) gave up the Castle of Dublin and the Regalia, deserved the name of rebels far more than the Nuncio or O'Neill, or the soldiers who fought under them. This Countess of Kildare promoted what she thought was good for her country and religion, according to the guiding principle of the noble family to which she belonged, which risked and lost almost everything in the cause. Their great sacrifices are not altogether forgotten, nor what they suffered in their worldly means and position, because they loved their country "not wisely, but too well." Their devotion to Ireland and Catholicity will bear favourable comparison with that of any Norman family that ever landed on our shores. The same may be said of the Eustaces of Baltinglass. The Countess could not have legally demised Kilkea to the outlawed Jesuits; what she probably did was, to demise it to her kinsman, the above named Father Robert Nugent, who happened to be Provincial of the Jesuits at the time.

"Archbishop Paul Cullen wrote in 1859, that he had met with an old MS. at Rome, in which it was stated that on the 16th December, 1684, two strings of pearls, one containing 106, the other 110 pearls, were presented to the Church of Loretto by Elizabeth Nugent, Countess of Kildare. They were brought to Italy by Richard Archdekin, the author of a famous treatise on Theology, and sent by him to Loretto, where they were presented by Robert Buckley, the English Penitentiary in that town."—*The Earls of Kildare and their Ancestors, by the Marquis of Kildare*. Dublin, 1862.

upon as the rendezvous of the besieging armies. Preston arrived there on the 9th of November; O'Neill, with whom was the Nuncio, on the 11th. The united armies of Leinster and Munster, assembled at Lucan, consisted of 16,000 foot, and as many hundred horse. The Nuncio did his best to reconcile O'Neill and Preston to work together for the common cause, and for a while indulged the hope that he had succeeded; but it seemed utterly impossible for these two commanders to agree for any length of time. Besides all the other things that alienated them from each other, their tempers were of the most opposite characters. Preston was a changeling, who did not seem to know his own mind for an hour together, and was withal hot and choleric, saying things hurriedly, of which he had often cause to repent. If there was anything stable in him, it was the desire to please Ormonde, and act under him. O'Neill was a man of few words, cool, thoughtful, and reserved.

But we must go back a little. The rejection of the Peace was one of the severest checks that Ormonde had yet encountered. He entered Kilkenny in triumph, and had it proclaimed with all but regal dignity. No doubt he felt very triumphant, but like a stately ship in full sail that suddenly hears the thunder of cannon across her bows, he is "brought to" in the most sudden and unexpected manner. *Vulneratus non victus*, however, was his motto, and so he looked about for fresh appliances and new combinations to sustain what he was always ostentatiously putting forward as "the king's service," which was a mere vague phrase that had no meaning in the mouth of that diplomatist, and was commonly used to reject applications, and refuse concessions, without giving any real reason for so doing. The first thing Ormonde did was to apply to the king's enemies, the English Parliament, for assistance. Some people may think it must have cost him many pangs to seek aid from such a quarter—to seek aid for his sovereign from subjects in open rebellion against that sovereign; but an intimate knowledge of Ormonde's character greatly modifies that opinion; and the course of this history abundantly shows that he would sooner put himself into the hands of the king's fiercest foes, provided they were Protestants, than condescend to trust his greatest friends and supporters, if they were Catholics. This treachery (as it was held to be) of opening negotiations with the Parliamentarians alarmed many of the king's most influential and loyal supporters; it alarmed the Catholic and faithful Clanrickard; it alarmed the Protestant Lord Digby, the king's Chief Secretary of State; it alarmed Viscount Taaffe, and many others. Digby and Clanrickard laid their heads together to

arrange some plan by which the Commissioners from the Parliament could be dispensed with. In doing this they, as they believed, proceeded with the full approval of Ormonde, whom they kept regularly informed of their proceedings. The chief part of their design was to detach Preston from the Nuncio, and bring him over to Ormonde, who would be thus in a position to deal with the Parliament and the Nuncio on very independent terms. Preston was a great Ormondist; but the man of all others whom he believed in, and admired most, was Clanrickard. Hence that nobleman was regarded as the right man to deal with him. Two obstacles stood prominently in the way of Digby's and Clanrickard's project: (1), Ormonde's known determination to make no substantial concessions, present or future, to the Catholics; and (2), Preston's attachment to the Catholic religion, and his strong desire to secure concessions for it. Digby had been recently in France, and returning to Ireland in July, drew up what he called a "Declaration about the Peace of Ireland." This document opens with solemn authority: "Being returned hither to Dublin out of France," he begins, "with the full assurances newly received from the king, my master, that he had redoubled his positive orders unto the Marquis of Ormonde" to make peace with the Catholics of Ireland, "according to the articles agreed on, and also to dispense them from sending the men originally promised by them," he, on the part of his Majesty, repudiates the letter of the 11th of June (written from Newcastle, "signed Charles Rex," and attested "Lanerick") forbidding such peace as contrary to the king's "free judgment and will." If Ormonde's peace did not give full satisfaction to all the Catholics, it is clear that Digby had the king's command to enlarge its concessions, for he says, "and I do further declare with the same solemnity and engagement of my life, that if the peace of Ireland shall not be presently concluded, the hinderers of it are the occasion of subverting and destroying the main foundation resolved and laid by his Majesty, for the recovery of his own, his crown, and posterity's rights, as aforesaid, whether by way of accommodation or war; *for the preventing of which irreparable mischief, if there should be the least danger thereof by the scruples of any,* I will freely take the whole matter upon myself to answer to his Majesty, as his Secretary of State, with my life, this declaration of his will."*

Digby took the resolution of making a visit to the Nuncio at Grangemelon, on the Barrow, near Athy; in which proceeding

* Carte, Vol. III., p. 491. Fol. Ed. The Italics are mine. J. O'R.

he seems to have had more than one object in view. He was evidently entrusted with an elastic commission by the King, so in the first place he wished to sound the Nuncio as to the minimum of concessions which would satisfy him; and in the next place he was anxious to see, with his own eyes, the number and efficiency of O'Neill's troops. When he announced this determination to Ormonde that darksome man treated the project as a wild ill-considered freak, for he was evidently afraid that Digby would come to some arrangement with the Nuncio. He writes to Digby—"The strange alteration, the very rumour of your going this journey hath wrought, though known only by my giving Pate your arms, is beyond belief, and to me the greatest instance of the *mad mistakings* of this age, that I have yet observed. I have studied your case with as much or more industry than my own, and cannot think how you have brought yourself into this *fine condition*, or how you shall get out of it."* In his next letter to Ormonde, Digby puts forward every argument he can to prove that what is best for "the King's service" is to seduce Preston from the Nuncio and O'Neill. He says, "although I am resolved not to be confident of anything, yet I have hourly more and more reason to be so, that Preston's compliance with the Nuncio hath been only to preserve himself, and to get such a body together as may make him as considerable as O'Neill; which now in a few days he will have; and that body consisting of all those forces which the Marquess of Ormonde hath most reason to hope well of, and that if he (Preston) may have but *private satisfaction for the security of religion*, so far as he did understand it to have been secured by the Articles of Peace, *but finds it indeed not to be*, that he will join heartily with the Marquess of Ormonde to *destroy those Ulster barbarians*. That which makes me the more assured of this is, that he presseth earnestly, that I should get the Marquess of Clanrickard to come to the army, to be their chief; and that I find so violent an animosity in all his officers against O'Neill and his army, that I am persuaded, though he should fail us, they will all come over to the Marquess of Ormonde with their troops without their general's consent, rather than ever join with them. This being so, and O'Neill's army no more considerable than I write to you to-day, that is but five thousand foot well armed, and three thousand tag-rags, with 700 or 800 horse at most, the most contemptible that ever was seen, there will be little occasion to apprehend any danger to Dublin,

* Carte, Vol. III., p. 503. Pate appears to have been Digby's servant. The Italics are mine. J. O'R.

and consequently no colour of reason to destroy the corn of your own quarters, which, having such a strength of bone as you have, nothing can hinder you from doing when you please. I most humbly but most earnestly conjure you by all the good that you can hope for *from anything we have designed*, not to suffer yourself to be engaged by the importunity of others (those others being his Council, no doubt), to that which must make you *wholly depend upon those you detest most*.* Digby evidently means the Parliamentarians here; but he makes a mistake, wilful or otherwise, in saying the Parliamentarians were the people Ormonde detested most. They were not, as the event proved. He was continually proving by his conduct, that his hatred for his Catholic fellow-countrymen was far more intense than the hatred he may have entertained for any other people whatever.

So much for the plot to detach Preston from the Nuncio; but there was plot upon plot, the next being one to seize the Nuncio and make a prisoner of him! On this business Digby writes to Ormonde, "the Nuncio comes to-morrow to live at Grangemellon, where I conceive it will be much easier surprising him from hence by water, without any adventure in the attempt, than to steal my horses from Leixlip, especially he having at least twelve on his guard of my foot soldiers, which left Dublin upon your application to the Parliament. If the Marquess of Ormonde approve of the thing, command the governor of this place to obey such orders as he shall receive from me."† Ormonde did approve of the proposal in the following words: "I SEND THE DIRECTION DESIRED TO CARLOW, AND WITH THE FEAT DONE."‡ How strangely this cool approbation contrasts with Ormonde's indignation at O'Neill having attempted, as was believed, to intercept him in his return from Kilkenny to Dublin. But Digby hoped to be able to effect still more; for he writes to Ormond on the 13th November—"If his Lordship (Lord Taaffe) can be thoroughly engaged with some that I can dispose of in such a bold undertaking, I think it no hard matter to send the Nuncio *and O'Neill prisoners to Dublin*."§

Lord Taaffe, who was a principal party to the negotiations with Preston, wrote on the 23rd of October a letter to Ormonde in which he says, "that the command of Preston's army is offered to Lord

* Carte III., p. 506. *Ibid.* 506-7.

† This letter is dated from Carlow, October 18th, 1846. *Ibid.*, p. 508.

‡ Ormonde to Digby, 22nd Oct. *Ib.*, p. 509.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 514.

Clanrickard, so security be had in religion," and that the officers of that army would not fight against Ormonde, "if they may have satisfaction in their religion." In quoting these expressions from Taaffe's letter Ormonde takes up the *role* of injured innocence, and gives vent to his indignation at the treatment he has been subjected to by the Confederates. He says—"The greatest hurt that lies in their power to do, is already done; so that unless for the preservation of some honest men, that are violently carried away, I should refuse all treaty; and as it is, *will never be forced from those grounds I have laid to myself*," which being interpreted means—*I will never consent to any real legal toleration of the Catholic religion in Ireland.**

The Nuncio rejected Clanrickard's proposals, but his having done so daunted neither Digby nor Clanrickard. Both were, at this time, with Preston at his quarters in Leixlip Castle, urging him to accept Clanrickard's terms, although the Nuncio had already rejected the terms; and in this they seemed to have completely succeeded. "Yesterday," writes Digby to Ormonde on the 18th of November, "my Lord Marquess of Clanrickard's negociation and mine was brought to the conclusion, which you will perceive in the two inclosed papers; whereunto, not only all Preston's army, but Sir Phelim O'Neill, with a principal part of O'Neill's (Owen Roe's), do engage. As for the Nuncio and his frightened Council dispersed over the face of the earth, there is no hopes of reducing them but by force, which will soon be effected. I must confess unto your Lordship, that I am so satisfied by Father Oliver Darcy, that Preston's part hath been wholly conducted from the very beginning merely to prevent his destruction, and to preserve a power to effect what he now hath done, that I am most secure of the said father's of General Preston's and most of his officers' honesty and integrity."† Poor Digby thought Ormonde would be delighted with his bringing Preston over to their side, but Ormonde had made up his mind to close with the Parliament Commissioners, and to throw cold water on all that Digby and Clanrickard had effected with Preston. This evidently incensed Digby very much, who, on the 22nd November,

* Letter to Taaffe, Carte, Vol. III., p. 509. The italics are mine. J. O'R. See the same sentiment more fully expressed at p. 373 by Ormonde. It is rather remarkable that Carte does not give Taaffe's letter to which Ormonde replies, so it is only from Ormonde's letter we know anything of what Taaffe wrote to him.

† Carte, Vol. III., p. 516. Sir Phelim O'Neill was married to Preston's daughter and held high command under his cousin, Owen Roe.

wrote to Ormonde—"I am most confident that if your Excellence did dislike my Lord of Clanrickard's or my proceedings in the way of the service, or that you did not intend to proceed in that way, you would be so kind to us as to have let us know it ere now; whereby we might either repair the error, or at least bring ourselves off in the best manner we could, having made it our chief care to manage things so, as that your Excellence might have only what share you pleased in the burthen of this negociation."* Next day Ormonde wrote to Digby rejecting formally the arrangements come to with Preston, for which he gives many reasons too long to be inserted here, but the essence of which are contained in these words—"no concessions to the Catholics." If Ormonde's letter just referred to vexed and disappointed Digby, his letter rejecting Clanrickard's proposals altogether laid him entirely prostrate. Then he expressed his feelings: "I have received this morning your Excellence's letter without a date, wherein you are pleased to discuss the matters proposed unto you by me six days since, concerning the Marquess of Clanrickard's engagement and negotiation; *which truly I cannot consider without such a heart-breaking amazement to me as renders me almost unable to make any reply.*"†

I do not find what authority Clanrickard had for offering the engagements which he did, but the Nuncio says "little or nothing was added [to terms previously imposed], and that no security was given save the word of Clanrickard himself, who promised, in case of the violation of articles, to join the Confederation, as if the gain of his sole person would outweigh all the dangers which might follow."‡

A striking and suggestive commentary on Clanrickard's proposal is that whilst the Nuncio and the rest of the Council were discussing it a messenger knocked at the door of the chamber in which they were, and announced that the English forces had landed and were received into Dublin. At this announcement they all rose from their seats and at once left the room. O'Neill, by a cannon shot, summoned his men to their posts, and with his army retired into Meath during the night. It had rained so much for many days before that the

* Carte, Vol. III., p. 522.

† Ibid., p. 525.

‡ Report on the Proceedings of the Catholic Army against Dublin; the Embassy in Ireland, p. 228. Clanrickard's engagement amounted to this only:—"That he would use his best endeavours unto his Majesty to give full content unto the Confederate Catholics."

flood had carried away the bridge which crossed the Liffey at Leixlip, and O'Neill had to construct a temporary bridge of trees and such other timber as he could find ; by this means his army crossed the river during the night. The Nuncio and the rest of the Council proceeded to Kilkenny, whilst the ever-changing Preston remained behind them. Less than six weeks before he had sworn obedience to the Council ; but as soon as O'Neill and the Nuncio had taken their departure he entered into a solemn engagement "to observe the late Peace, with Clanrickard's additional concessions and securities, to be from thenceforth obedient to his Majesty's authority, and to join with the Marquis of Ormonde against all his Majesty's enemies, *and such as should not, upon the same terms, submit to the Peace.*"*

There seems to be a good deal of mystery about the messenger who, with a few hasty words, literally put to flight the great army then beleaguering Dublin. It is not stated whence he came or by whom despatched. His information, moreover, was incorrect ; the Parliament troops had been allowed to land—in fact had been requested by Ormonde to land, but he did not admit them even into the city, not to speak of the Castle. Three places in the suburbs were assigned to them for camping ground, namely, Ring's End, Lowsie Hill and Baggot Rath. This movement on Ormonde's part, seems to have been partly diplomatic and partly strategic. 1. Being allowed to land and camp in the immediate vicinity of Dublin must have gratified the Parliament troops: they had not yet got as far as the Castle, but they were on their way to it. 2. Their landing was naturally expected to have much influence on the movements of the Confederates, and upon the spirit in which they would receive Clanrickard's proposals. If they rejected them the Parliament troops would have been important contingents to aid Ormonde in fighting them ; and from Preston's previous and subsequent conduct there can be no doubt that, in such an event, he would join Ormonde against O'Neill, or at least remain neutral.† 3. If Clanrickard's articles of peace were accepted by the Confederates, Ormonde could easily have requested or compelled the Parliament troops to retire to their ships again. The messenger who knocked at the door of the chamber in which the Generals were in consultation, arrived at

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. I., p. 590. This engagement was made whilst "the Marquis of Ormonde was . . . taken up with a very troublesome treaty with the Commissioners of the Parliament," &c. *Ibid.*

† See Aphorismical Discovery, Vol. I., p. 130, and the Nuncio's account of the non-success of the attempt on Dublin.

such a wonderful critical moment, that his part must have been preconcerted; he must have been in some indirect and covert way Ormonde's messenger, most probably instructed by Clanrickard or Preston, or both, Clanrickard being still with that General at his quarters in Leixlip Castle. At any rate, whoever sent the puppet-messenger, the wily Marquis seems to have been at the end of the wire that moved him.

Ormonde at this time was in great straits; he had no army able to fight the Confederates, and such as he had was in almost a state of starvation in Dublin and its neighbourhood. He moved them into Westmeath and Longford with the hope of subsisting them for a few weeks at least. Meantime he sent Lord Digby to Paris, in the hope that he would there be able to receive "some and unconstrained directions from the King, and also some considerable supplies from France." "He was not without apprehension that the distress of the King's affairs might possibly occasion some command being directed to him from thence in relation to the Irish, which might thwart those rules which he had laid down for his conduct in the point of religion, the only point in which he should resort to the liberty of a subject, to obey by suffering. Others might, perhaps, have less scruples in that matter, and lest his own might occasion any disappointment in the King's service, he thought it fit to inculcate again what he had often mentioned to Lord Digby, that he could not execute any orders or agree to any concessions 'that might seem to perpetuate to the Roman Catholics either churches or church-livings, or that might essentially take from the Protestant, or give to their clergy ecclesiastical jurisdiction. As for other freedoms against penalties for the quiet exercise of their religion, he was clearly of opinion, they not only might, but ought to be given them, if his Majesty should find cause to own them for anything but rebels.'"

The Articles of Agreement, by which Ormonde resigned everything to the Commissioners sent over by the Parliament, were agreed to on the 18th and signed on the 19th of June, 1647. They were ten in number and provided:—1. That the Marquis of Ormonde was to deliver up *at once* to the said Commissioners the City of Dublin, together with all the places and garrisons under his command, including ordnance, ammunition, stores, &c.; and that he was, on the 28th of July, to resign into their hands the Sword, and the other ensigns of Royalty, and everything connected with his Lieutenancy which should be demanded. 2. All Protestants not actually engaged in the rebellion were to

be "secured in their persons, estates and goods." 3. Provided that Protestants residing in Ireland and having estates in England, might "compound for the same at the rate of two years' profit, as they were before the beginning of the troubles." 4. Provided that such as had "come under contribution, and did then live in the English quarters, and would continue payment of the contribution, should be protected in their persons and estates" from the soldiers of the Parliament as well as from those of the enemy. 5. The Marquis of Ormonde was to enjoy his estate and to "have indemnity against all debts contracted for the support of the army." 6. He was also to be protected in his person and goods for the space of twelve months "against all suits, arrests, molestation, or disturbance from any person whatsoever *for any debt owing by him to any person whatsoever, before the rebellion in Ireland.*" 7. The said Marquis, and such noblemen and gentlemen as chose to leave Ireland with him, or by themselves, with their families and a suitable number of attendants were to be granted free passes for that purpose, which were to hold good for three months. 8. By this Article the Marquis obtained leave to reside in England for twelve months without being bound by any oaths or engagements. 9. He was to receive £13,877 14s. 9d. expended by him in maintaining the garrisons of Dublin, Dundalk and other places. On fulfilling the obligations he had undertaken to the Commissioners, he was to receive £3,000 of this sum: the remainder to be paid to him in two moieties; the first, fifteen days after sight, the second in six months. This money was secured to him by bills "to be accepted by sufficient men in France or Holland." 10. The tenth and last Article provided for pensions to distressed clergymen and others to the value of £2,000 a year, until they could receive a like amount from their own estates.

At the end of the Articles, but not strictly speaking, a portion of them, the following observations are inserted:—"And to the end, that upon publication of the Articles, these popish Recusants who have not assisted nor adhered to the rebellion in this Kingdom, may be encouraged to continue in their habitations, and in enjoyment of their estates in confidence, 'tis declared by the said Arthur Annesley, Esquire, &c., in behalf of the Parliament of England, that the said Parliament *will take them into consideration for favour, according as they shall demean themselves, in their present service; and thereof they are hereby assured.*"*

* The Italics in this extract are the author's.

Such was the moonshine which Ormonde secured for the loyal Catholics who had fought under him, and who had sustained the King's cause by their blood and their treasure.*

The proud Ormonde, who, in his intercourse with the Catholics, treated them with haughty contempt, soon began to experience the quality of the Parliamentarians. He had to send hostages to England as security for the fulfilment of the above Articles, one of these hostages being his own son. He offered to reduce his money demand from the Parliament by £10,000, if he were permitted to bring with him into France 5,000 foot and 500 horse *unarmed*, but he was refused. Nor did Parliament keep its word with him about the payments; they were not made at the time stipulated, and £1,515 of the money promised was never paid at all. Ormonde used to be always complaining of the Catholics for not paying up the money they had promised for concessions which they never received. He gave up everything—fortresses, ordnance, ammunition, supplies,—the City of Dublin, Castle and all, without obtaining the price of them. It was a Nemesis indeed!

The Commissioners agreed that Ormonde and his family were to continue in Dublin Castle "without trouble or molestation" until the 28th of July, unless the Committee at Derby House declared their desire, that they should remove from it sooner. Ormonde had accordingly made up his mind to remain as arranged, but the Commissioners soon showed a desire to be rid of him, and so began to make the place unpleasant for him. They set guards on Lord Taaffe, Colonel Barry and others of his friends, and when he complained of this breach of the Articles, they replied that they were the competent judges of their own actions, and would not allow anybody else to judge of them. On the 16th of July they gave him notice to remove with his family from the Castle, and to deliver up the *Regalia* within four days. Up to that the Castle (by agreement) had been guarded by his own soldiers, but on this intimation, he in evident disgust gave up the care of it at once to the Commissioners. The proud Ormonde had got many "rubs" (as the word then was) in the space of a very few days, but one great humiliation he avoided, and that was the ceremony of giving up the

* Many of our chief families came to utter ruin because they preferred their faith and their country to mean time-serving and self-interest. Alas, the descendants of those great men who staked everything for Catholicity and Ireland have been blotted out, or live in beggarly obscurity, while the representatives of those who made their terms in time with the enemy, enjoy the possessions thus secured, and usurp honours to which they have no title.

Regalia; he left that to others, and proceeded on board the ship that was waiting for him, and in which he sailed for Bristol on the 28th of July, 1647.

Billings says that Ormonde had orders from the King to treat with the Parliament and to give them up the fortresses when he could hold them no longer; and that this order was given, either because, on account of the Nuncio's influence, he suspected the fidelity of the Catholics, or because he feared severe treatment from the Parliament. This Order, Billings proceeds to say, the Marquis took exceedingly ill,* for he well knew the perfidy of the Parliament, but what could he do under the circumstances, believing, as he did, that the desire and resolve of the Nuncio was to transfer the Kingdom to a foreign prince? For these astounding assertions I have failed to find any authority, and if the Order existed, Carte, it may be presumed, would have referred to it. Ormonde himself does not allege it as a reason for his action in the case, but gives far different reasons.† If such an order ever was given, which I do not believe, it could not be worth anything, for it would not be the King's order, but that of the Parliament, a fact which nobody should know better than Ormonde; for when Charles gave himself up to the Scots, he took the first opportunity of warning him not to regard any order received in his name *as his order*, unless it reached him through some source independent of the Scots. This warning became doubly forcible in the present case, when he was in the power of the Parliament.‡

Ormonde was ready enough at putting forward his great devotion to the King and his anxiety to obey his commands and wishes. But this was only when they did not clash with his own views; for when they did, he managed to evade them by various shifts, such as silence, delay, and above all, by that unmeaning but favourite excuse of his—"to do so would not be for the King's service." The orders sent to him by Charles in 1644, were of the most pressing and peremptory kind, yet they were disobeyed. His Majesty says in a letter from Oxford, written on the 27th of February of that year: "Ormonde, The impossibility of preserving my Protestant subjects in Ireland by a continuation of the war, having moved me to give you those powers and direc-

* "Mandatum hoc pessimè habuit Marchionem." See *Vindiciæ Catholicorum*, pp. 45-6. *Paresiis*, M.D.C.L.

† See p. 251, et seq.

‡ Borlase says several persons of quality arrived about this time in Dublin, and brought an order to this effect from the King; but he does not name even one of these persons, nor does he prove that any of them saw the King. *History of Rebellion*, p. 231-2. Clarendon asserts the same with an equal absence of authority. *Historical View*, &c., p. 47. Dublin Ed., 1719-20.

tions which I have formerly done, for the concluding of a peace there; and the same growing daily much more evident, that alone were reason enough for me to enlarge your powers, and make my commands in the point more positive. But besides these considerations, it being now manifest that *the English rebels have (as far as in them lies) given the command of Ireland to the Scots*; that their aim is a total subversion of religion and regal power; and that nothing less will content them, or purchase peace here; I think myself bound in conscience not to let slip the means of settling that kingdom (if it may be) fully under my obedience *nor to lose that assistance which I may hope from my Irish subjects*, for such scruples, as in a less pressing condition might reasonably be stuck at by me for their satisfaction. I do, therefore, **COMMAND you to conclude a peace with the Irish** **WHATEVER IT COST**, so that my Protestant subjects there may be secured, and my regal authority preserved. But for all this you are to make me the best bargain you can, and not to discover your enlargement of power till you needs must. And tho' I leave the managing of this great and necessary work intirely to you, yet I cannot but tell you, that if the suspension of Poyning's Act for such bills as shall be agreed on between you there, and the **PRESENT TAKING AWAY of the Penal Laws against Papists by a law, will do it, I shall not think it a hard bargain**, so that freely and vigorously they engage themselves in my assistance *against my rebels of England and Scotland*, for which no conditions can be too hard, not being against conscience and honour. So I rest your most assured constant friend,

CHARLES R.**

Of course nothing was done, and Birch gives the reason, when he says, "The Marquis of Ormonde was so zealous a Protestant, that he was absolutely averse to the granting of the terms upon which the Irish rebels insisted."† Ormonde's neglect, or rather his more than tacit refusal to obey Charles, led to the employment of Glamorgan to negotiate with the Irish.

Whilst negotiations were still proceeding between Ormonde and the Confederates, Ormonde received a letter from the King, dated Newcastle, the 11th of June, 1646, forbidding him to proceed any further "in Treaty with the rebels" or to make any conditions with them after the receipt of it.‡ At the

* Carte, No. xviii. p. 9, Vol. III.

† Birch's Inquiry, p. 12. Birch himself was a Protestant of a very decided kind, for he says in his preface that the "main design" of Popery is to establish "the most absolute tyranny over the conscience and reason of mankind." The Capitals and Italics in the above letter are mine.—J. O'R.

‡ Carte, Vol. III., No. ccccliii., p. 474.

juncture Lord Digby arrived from the Continent. *He declared that the King was held in captivity by the Scots, and would not send any instructions to his servants but such as they extorted from him . . . that he had found means to send private notice to Paris, directing that the Queen, the Prince, and all his ministers, should pursue the orders he had given while free.** "Lord Digby," says Carte, "arrived from France with an account that the Scots had broke all their engagements to his Majesty, and treated him barbarously; that they had made him a close prisoner, and had not only chased from him Mr. Ashburnham, who was the only person that accompanied him to their army, but had set forth a Proclamation, denouncing death against any who had served him during the troubles, that should presume to come among them."† In face of this information, Mr. Carte gives as one of the reasons why Ormonde gave Dublin up to the Parliament, "the hopes that Dublin might be restored to his Majesty without trouble, *when the Scots should assert his Majesty's cause, or the English return to their duty.*"‡ The Scots assisted his Majesty's cause by selling him to the Parliament for £200,000, and the English returned to their duty by taking off his head in front of the palace of Whitehall. Still Ormonde secured one success, and one on which he always seemed to set the greatest value:—*his Catholic fellow-countrymen had got no concessions.*

The commissioners to whom Ormonde surrendered Dublin Castle, and all the other forts of the kingdom then in his possession, were:—Mr. Annesley, Sir Robert King, Sir Robert Meredith, Colonel John More, and Colonel Michael Jones. They, without any delay, proceeded to exercise their powers. On the 19th of June, the day on which the treaty with Ormonde was signed, they announced to the protestant clergy of Dublin that they should discontinue the use of the English Liturgy. The clergy represented to them the necessity of a set form of prayer such as the Liturgy, which was, moreover, taken from the Liturgies of the Primitive Church; but the great argument of the clergy—their *argumentum ad hominem*—was, the "gap" the taking away of the Liturgy "would open to the Jesuits and other papists to enter in among them, to possess their pulpits, and to seduce the people."§ The Commissioners paid no attention to

* Leland's Ireland, Vol. III., p. 286. Carte, Vol. I., p. 572.

† Ibid.

‡ Carte, Vol. I., p. 585. Mr. Carte should have managed to have had a better memory.

§ Ibid., p. 605.

this artful appeal, but strictly enforced their order. The Episcopalians at once gave up their services, except Anthony Martin, bishop of Meath and provost of Trinity College, who continued to officiate as usual.

The unceremonious way in which Ormonde was turned out of Dublin Castle before the time fixed for his departure had expired, was only a slight foretaste of the treatment he received in England from the Puritans, to whom he had wickedly and treacherously delivered Ireland, as far as it was in his power to do so. "The articles," says Clarendon, "that had been made with him at Dublin by the Commissioners, and confirmed by the two houses of Parliament at Westminster, were every way violated and infringed, in the most important particulars; as in the imprisonment of Sir Faithful Fortescue, whose security was provided for by the Articles; in the delay that was used in the payment of the money due to him; and whereas he was to reside in any part of England he pleased, in all freedom, for the space of one year, without the imposition of any oath or engagement, and at the end thereof he had liberty to transport himself and his family into what foreign parts he pleased. As soon as they began to be unmasked towards his Majesty, they banished the Marquis from London, forbidding him to come within twenty-five miles of the city; and all this before he had ever spoke with the Scots' Commissioners, or given them the least shadow of a pretence against him, saving only that of having a heart impossible to be corrupted towards his master, and an hand likely to be of use to him; and shortly after the King was in the Isle of Wight, directions were given to apprehend and seize upon the Marquis of Ormonde, who thereupon concluding from their wicked carriage and barbarous demeanour to his Majesty, whom they had now made their prisoner in the Castle of Carisbrooke, that it would be very impertinent for him to insist upon the performance, and expostulate for the breach of the agreement which had been made with him, he, with all secrecy transported himself out of the kingdom, and arrived safely in France about the end of the year 1647, having spent in England little more, from the time that he came out of Ireland, than six months."*

Carte gives, substantially, the facts about the treatment of Ormonde recorded above, but he tones them down, so that they lose the force and significance which Clarendon imparts to them; nor has Carte a word to say in condemnation of the flagrant breaches of

* An Historical View of the Affairs of Ireland, &c., pp. 58-9. Dublin, 1719-20.

the Articles practised by the Parliament against his hero. Not he, although so eloquent on all occasions, in denouncing the Nuncio, and every Catholic Confederate, who was not a creature of Ormonde's; and this, commonly, for acts explainable or defensible, and not unfrequently, for such as challenged the approval of honest, unbiassed minds.*

In his report on the state of the kingdom in the year 1647, the Nuncio says:—"I find that in four things there is a great change; 1st, the scarcity of money; 2nd, the great increase of disunion; 3rd, the loss of several towns in Munster; 4th, the devastation of the country by the enemy, and even by the marches and halts of our own troops. In other points the affairs of the Provinces are much in the same state, or perhaps in some a little better."†

The year 1647, which we have just reviewed, opened with bright prospects for the cause of Catholicity and Ireland. The General Assembly, to the number of three hundred, met in Kilkenny on the 10th of January, and after much warm discussion it was resolved that the treaty with Ormonde was invalid, and "that the nation would accept of no peace not containing a sufficient security for the religion, lives, and estates of the Confederate Catholics."‡ Only twelve out of the three hundred voted against this resolution. But, through many causes, the year turned out to be disastrous: jealousy, dissensions, incapacity, and perhaps even perfidy, wrought ruin among the ranks of the Confederates. Preston lost at Dungan's Hill the finest army the Confederates ever put into the field, and O'Neill was obliged to give up his plans in Connaught to save Leinster from the victorious Jones, as of course he did, compelling him to take refuge within the walls of Dublin with celerity. Inchiquin carried everything in Munster. He took its chief stronghold, Cahir, without almost striking a blow. He slaughtered the priests and people of Cashel even in the sanctuary; whilst Ormonde's miserable creature, Taaffe, at the head of a fine army, stood looking on, or kept at a safe distance.§

* See Life of Ormonde, Vol. 2, p. 15.

† Letter [in cipher] to Cardinal Panzirolo, dated January 7th, 1648.

‡ Haverty's Ireland, 561.

§ Taaffe, according to the Author of the *Aphorismical Discovery*, behaved still worse at the battle of Knocknanuss (*Choc-na-noe*=hill of the fauns), near Buttevant, where the famous Col-kitto M'Donnell was killed. He was of gigantic size and strength. Refusing to accept the Covenant in Scotland, he came to Ulster and joined the Catholic army, in which he soon became distinguished. He was appointed by the Earl of Antrim to command the forces sent to Scotland to aid Montrose. He returned to Ireland in 1647, and was appointed by the Supreme Council Lieutenant-General under Taaffe in Munster.

The sun of the Confederation which rose in such splendour in the beginning of the year set in gloom at its termination. So that after more than five years of sacrifice and effort, the cause of the Catholic Confederation had made no progress.

When Ormonde was compelled to go to England, he kept up an active correspondence with Ireland through his spies and agents. All the Generals of the Confederation, except O'Neill, were mere creatures of his, and really fought for him and his views, rather than for the cause they were engaged in, and had sworn to maintain. Ormonde got into negotiations with the notorious Murrough O'Brien, Baron Inchiquin, known to Munster and to history as "Murrough the burner," who at this time was fighting for the Parliament, but who had deserted the king through disappointed ambition, because he was not promoted to the Presidency of Munster on the death of his father-in-law, St. Leger. This, of course, Ormonde well knew; and as he was quite ready to treat with anyone whom he hoped to turn to account, he approached Inchiquin tentatively in order to win him back to his old allegiance, if possible. The negotiations with him, it is probable, were begun before Ormonde left Ireland; but it is only after his arrival in England we have any distinct account of them. Nine days before the vote of "Non-Addresses to the King" passed in the Parliament [3 Jan. 1648], he removed from London, and proceeded to Acton, about ten miles from Bristol, "a place convenient for the correspondence which he had now entered into with Lord Inchiquin, for the better performance of the part assigned him in Ireland."* If

M'Donnell, at the above battle, commanded on the right of the field; Taaffe had no artillery, and M'Donnell, who knew this, made a dash at that of the enemy, and got possession of it. In his ardour he got into danger, but "his proper general observing how he was too far engaged, instead of relieving or seconding him, oblivious of all honour and worth, commanded the rest of his army to march out of the field, leaving this only gentleman in action against the multitude of the enemy." He was made prisoner, but afterwards killed by one Foordome, a captain of horse under Inchiquin. This I give under reserve; the accounts of the battle are most contradictory. See *Aphorismical Discovery*, Vol. I., p. 174. The M'Donnells of Antrim are descended from this brave soldier.

"The rest of the foot were posted in the right wing under Lieutenant-General MacDonnell, supported by Colonel Purcell with two regiments of his horse. When the battle joined, Purcell charged the English horse opposed to him with great bravery, and MacDonnell's Highlanders, after a fire, throwing down their pieces, fell sword in hand into the enemy's left, and drove them two miles before them with considerable slaughter, and with very little loss on their own side; made themselves masters of the cannon and carriages, keeping possession of them for a full hour." Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 9.

* Ibid., p. 15. Ormonde's negotiations with Inchiquin accounts for the Confederates' anxiety to make a truce with him, and also goes far to explain Taaffe's otherwise unaccountable proceedings in Munster, especially at the battle of Knocknanuss. Taaffe had a larger and better supplied army in Munster than Inchiquin, yet he did little or nothing against him.

Inchiquin failed him, he had the Scots to fall back upon, with whom he was likewise parleying. He even entertained hopes of effecting a combination in favour of the king between the Scots and Inchiquin. His usual confidant, Colonel J. Barry, was the agent to Inchiquin; Sir G. Hamilton was his go-between with the Scots. The Parliament suspecting, or having been informed, that Ormonde was intriguing with Inchiquin, their general, and perhaps with others, called upon him for a written undertaking that he would engage in nothing injurious to the Parliament during his stay in England. Having no wish to make such an engagement, he, as Carte mildly puts it, retired to France, where he arrived in good time to prepare the Queen and the Prince for the answer they should give to the Irish envoys who had been sent to them by the General Assembly.

Undoubtedly Ormonde was a man of great parts. His weakest point was, perhaps, the want of high military talents; but as for diplomacy—that is plotting—he was a veritable Palmerston born before his time. Like a clever betting man, he made his political book so skilfully that he could never suffer utter defeat—he must always win on something. It was believed by many that had the combined attempt of the Confederate forces succeeded in taking Dublin, no irreparable loss to Ormonde could come from it, for Preston, as General-in-Chief of Leinster, would claim it as his right to garrison the city, which he would hold rather for Ormonde than for the Confederates. He did not, however, wish it to be taken, because such an event would look like a defeat to the eyes of the empire, no matter how innocuous it proved; so he was, doubtless, glad to succeed in breaking up the Confederate armies by Clanrickard's management, and through the timely arrival of that mysterious messenger, who wrongly announced that the Parliamentarians had possession of Dublin. O'Neill and the Nuncio having been got rid of for the time, Ormonde was free to close with the Parliamentarians, who were the greatest enemies of his sovereign.*

Although the Nuncio or O'Neill never in any way declared against Charles, whose battles they were actually fighting, and had fought, Ormonde had the most implacable hatred for both, and always treated them with a reserve and hauteur little short of contempt, whilst he always showed the most marked respect to the king's enemies. For this conduct there seems to have been two principal reasons. 1. Because Ormonde hated

* The Parliamentarians were the Independents, who were enemies alike to the king and the Presbyterians.

the Catholic religion with an intensity which can only belong to a pervert. 2. Because O'Neill, who acted in concert with the Nuncio, represented the old Irish, whom Ormonde and all Palesmen looked upon as an alien and inferior race, unfit for the same rights and privileges as Englishmen, and to be "improved off the face of Ireland as soon as possible." This feeling existed when both races were Catholics, but became intensified after the change of religion in England,—a change never accepted by the old Irish.

The Parliamentarians, both in Dublin and England, knew enough of Ormonde to be aware that he could not cease from intriguing, and hence they got him out of Dublin with a celerity that provokes Carte's ire, and made England unpleasant and even dangerous for him, before half the stipulated time allowed him for residing there was expired. But in spite of all this vigilance on their part, he managed by his agents, and especially through the services of Colonel Barry, to keep up an intercourse with his friends in the Supreme Council and the General Assembly, and with Inchiquin, in order to instruct him in the part he was to play. Muskerry, as well as Preston and Taaffe, he kept informed of his designs, with a view to future combined action. The chief business which Ormonde and his supporters had now in hand was to get rid of the Nuncio and O'Neill, because they represented the claims of the Catholic Church, and were determined to agree to no peace or cessation which did not make legal provision for the full and free exercise of Catholic worship. But this concession Ormonde would never consent to, as he frequently declared. His fixed determination was not to concede anything to the Catholics but the merest toleration during good behaviour, and thus leave them open to persecution on any flimsy, false pretence, concocted by their enemies; to make them, in a word, a sort of ticket-of-leave men, to be relegated to the prison of persecution at the caprice of the existing powers. Carte and his followers blink this fact continually, because they knew it would not bear the light of discussion. In short, Ormonde's dealings with the Catholics prove that his rule was to get all he could from them, and give them nothing. His conduct towards them may, in fact, be thus translated into words: raise money for the king; apply all you get from the Pope, or from any other sources abroad, to the king's service; fight his battles here, and in England and Scotland; but as to concessions, you must, like dutiful subjects, await his Majesty's good pleasure and convenience. As if his Majesty had not, in the most flagrant manner, broken faith with them on previous occasions! After Inchiquin's decided victory at Knock-

nanuss, many at the Catholic side began seriously to think of a foreign protectorate. Three sovereigns were named, any of whom would be suitable for this office—His Holiness the Pope (Innocent the Tenth), the King of Spain, and the King of France. After some time the Assembly appointed three embassies, one to each Sovereign. The Nuncio was for despatching the embassy to the Pope some time before the others, in order to obtain the views of His Holiness on all religious matters; the other two were to proceed no further than Paris, where they were to await the return of the Roman envoys with those views. In this arrangement the Nuncio was supported by the representatives of both France and Spain. After considerable opposition the point was conceded by the Assembly, but the Roman embassy was driven back to port through stress of weather, and it, therefore, had no practical effect. The Nuncio was for making the Pope Protector, which seems somewhat strange, inasmuch as he had previously received orders from Rome not to allow that question to be mooted at all. On the 22nd of the previous July he was ordered "not to let that point [a protectorate by the Pope] ever come into consultation, for a protection at such a distance could be of no use to the Irish, who could expect but little succour from the Pope; it would expose the Holy See to the jealousy of Princes, and exhaust his exchequer, besides a thousand other reasons which forbid any thoughts of that nature."*

The Ormondites, in concert with France, wished for a French protectorate in order that the Prince (then with the Queen mother in that country) might be brought to Ireland, where, no doubt, the inevitable Ormonde would return and be installed as Lord Lieutenant again, and so become the Prince's political schoolmaster. The Nuncio was not opposed to the coming over of the Prince, except from the fact that it would necessitate the coming of Ormonde also, to enter on his old career of check-mating every Catholic movement for redress.

Two circumstances occurred about this time (Dec. 1647), which placed the majority of the General Assembly completely in the hands of the Ormondites. 1. The Province of Ulster, either from war-caused poverty, or some other reason, did not send its quota of members, seventy in number, to that body. They sent nine to represent them with proxies for the remainder, but the Assembly refused to admit the proxy votes. This weakened the Catholic party very much, for the northerners were the friends and followers

* Nuncio's Memoirs, f. 1588. Quoted by Carte, *Life of Ormonde*, Vol. II., p. 18.

of O'Neill, and would have supported his and the Nuncio's views. 2. Lord Muskerry, supposed to be at the Catholic side, but doing Ormonde's business most effectively in the Assembly, managed to have a new regulation made with regard to the Council, which was that supernumeraries should be appointed to represent members of that body, who, through some cause or other, were absent. The Assembly named a few at first, but by degrees went on naming others until they had forty-eight supernumeraries, "all of Lord Muskerry's partizans," and consequently of Ormonde's.* This made the Ormondites absolute masters of the Council.

The embassy to France turned out to be, as it was intended by the Ormondites to be, the really important one. It consisted of the Marquis of Antrim, Lord Muskerry, and Geoffrey Browne. The Marquis was only sent as a concession to the Nuncio's party, Heber M'Mahon, the Bishop of Clogher, having refused to go. The other two devoted Ormondites constituted the embassy. A number of demands agreed to by the Assembly and the Nuncio were sent to France by the Embassy, but they were only a blind. "The Queen received the propositions, and took time to consider what the King had formerly absolutely refused, and what she for that reason was already determined not to grant. She consulted the Marquis of Ormonde on the subject, and desired his opinion with regard to these demands as to what was necessary further to be done for the affairs of Ireland. He told her that he thought the answer to the Irish propositions should be so conceived as to show (*to the greatest advantage that general terms could express*) his Majesty's gracious inclinations towards the settlement of that kingdom, upon such conditions in matters of religion and of civil concernment, as should satisfy all those who had any desires towards peace."† The real instructions were sent by Preston and Taaffe, and are to be found in Carte. They directed Muskerry and Browne to assure the Queen and Prince, "that no power nor expectation of self-interest should ever make them decline those principles of loyalty to their King, which they had always professed, and should to their dying day continue unalterably in their minds and actions; that such was the condition, the strength, and affections of their armies, that they little valued those that had a mind, if they had

* Carte, Vol. II., p. 20. Nuncio's letter to Cardinal Panzirolo, dated 24th December, 1647.

† Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 22. The Italics in the above extract are mine.—J. O'R.

ability, to oppose them ; and that all the well-affected persons in the kingdom were resolved to join with them, and contribute their lives and fortunes to compass the end they aimed at, which was the re-establishment of the King's authority in all his dominions ; that though there was a party which endeavoured to traverse their measures, and to introduce a foreign jurisdiction, yet the practices of that party were well known, and it would be in their power to destroy it, if they had but assurances of assistance and countenance from the Queen and Prince ; that in their opinion the only way to reduce Ireland and make it entirely obedient and useful to the King was, that the Prince would be pleased to come over with a considerable proportion of money and arms, and with a resolution to condescend to the requests of his moderate and well-affected subjects ; in which case they engaged to put under his command such a body of forces as would not only settle Ireland, but with some assistance in England, be serviceable to regain his rights and interests in his other dominions ; and that if the Prince would neither come over, nor send supplies, he would, at least, be pleased to direct them how to dispose of themselves, and his other subjects, who would willingly know no other obedience, but what they owed to him."

"These were the instructions which Muskerry and Browne had most at heart. They were, however, obliged to join with Antrim in presenting to the Queen on April 2 the other propositions, given in charge to them all, and dictated by the clergy."*

When Ormonde gave up Dublin Castle to the Commissioners of the English Parliament, and took his departure from Ireland, he did so with the full intention of returning on the first favourable opportunity. But in order to be able to carry out his views on his return, some important changes in the situation in Ireland were deemed by him and his friends to be highly necessary. He, instead of the Nuncio, must rule the General Assembly and the Supreme Council ; nay more, the Nuncio and O'Neill, by some means or other, must be entirely got rid of. The absence of the Ulster delegates from the General Assembly at the close of 1647, and Muskerry's cunningly devised plan of proxies to represent absent members, threw the whole power of the Confederation into the hands of Ormonde, represented by Muskerry, Clanrickard, Preston, Taaffe, and many other able and influential supporters. The three commissioners who were sent with certain proposals to the Queen and Prince of Wales at St.

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 21, fol. Ed.

Germain's, and who were pronounced Ormondites, no doubt, spent much of their time with the Marquis, mapping out plans of action for the future. The prominent feature of such plans must have been to render the Nuncio and O'Neill powerless. If that were but accomplished, the Supreme Council of the Confederation might, with strict accuracy, be described as "Ormonde's Privy Council."

His adroit success in inducing Inchiquin once again to change sides, by deserting the Parliament, completely isolated the Nuncio and O'Neill; it placed every soldier in the country in Ormonde's hands, except those under O'Neill. As to the Scots they had no desire whatever for active service. They merely wished to be let alone, in order to live at their ease, as they had for a long time been doing. The crushing defeat of Taaffe at Knockanuss* left the Confederates in a very helpless and defenceless condition. Kilkenny was open to Inchiquin after his victory, and was only saved by O'Neill marching rapidly to its defence.

The Supreme Council was anxious for a Cessation of hostilities which they finally concluded with Inchiquin. It was made for five or six months, from May till November, 1648; and like almost everything connected with the period, it is no easy matter to get at the real facts about it. In a letter to Ormonde, still in France, Inchiquin puts forward this bold assertion:—"The Nuncio did no sooner perceive that I did decline this power, now ruling in England, than he did industriously apply himself to the use of all means to divert the Council and the people from a Cessation with me, *lest it should usher in his Majesty's authority*; which is evidenced to be his fear, by the advice given by him to the Council, to seek one with me, when he believed I would not do so."† And this has been repeated by Carte and his copiers without apparent investigation, and without even giving a reference to Inchiquin's letter. But as those gentlemen seem to have had nothing so much at heart as to damage the Nuncio, right or wrong, they were but too glad to put forward whatever was to his discredit. The Nuncio was never disloyal to the King, but he wanted freedom for the Catholic religion, in return for the great support he gave to the King's cause by the large sums of money sent from

* Commonly written Knockanos or Knockanose: *os* signifies a fawn; and when the word occurs in the genitive plural, as here, the termination is usually *nanuss*. See Joyce, I., 477.

† Inchiquin's letter to Ormonde, from Cork, 29th May, 1648. Carte's Ormonde, Vol. III., p. 575.

abroad and by the armies—the many armies—that were raised in Ireland to fight for the Catholic religion and for the rights of His Majesty. And it must be borne in mind, that the Confederation had solemnly sworn never to lay down their arms, until Catholicity was free in Ireland. But when the Ormondites got the majority in the General Assembly and in the Supreme Council, the whole of this was set aside, and all the fighting was to be done, and all the money was to be spent for the King, under Ormonde's guidance, while the granting of religious freedom was put off to an undefined future, which was sure never to arrive, and which Ormonde intended never should arrive.

The question of the Cessation with Inchiquin is discussed in letters which passed between the Nuncio and the Supreme Council on the subject, and it is safer to trust to them than to any partizan and unsupported statements that have been put forward. When the Confederates proposed a Cessation to Inchiquin, he treated them with nothing short of contempt, for instead of answering them in their collective capacity, he addressed himself to one of their number, Dr. Ffennell, a creature of Ormonde's.* The Nuncio was then in Waterford to which place they sent to him, in haste, to say that Inchiquin had declared for the King, that they hoped to get good conditions from him for a truce of five months, and they begged that the Nuncio would proceed to Kilkenny to aid in carrying out this project.† To this he agreed, but he sent before him reasons against the Cessation with Inchiquin, the chief of which were:—1. That it would not be proper to decide on a Cessation, without taking the "exchequer" into account, and summoning the generals to know if there were arms and soldiers enough to carry on the two wars then on hands in Munster and Leinster. 2. That as to Inchiquin having declared for the King, he "declared for him three times before and broke his faith; a thing which he is still more likely to do now, as His Majesty is in such

* "I have found out that the Council at Barry's suggestion has written to Inchiquin proposing a truce, and that he should come to deliberate on these matters. Inchiquin, to show that he does not recognise the Supreme Council as his superiors, has sent an answer to Dr. Fennell alone, who is one of the Council, demanding the most impertinent terms for a truce, and amongst them the payment of 4,000 crowns a week, a sum, which distributed amongst our own soldiers, would suffice to recover the whole province. The Council however, sent two deputies to treat with him, unable to dissimulate their anxiety to attain the blessed end of Ormonde's return." Barry, as we have frequently seen, was Ormonde's trusted agent in all his secret negotiations.—*Embassy to Ireland: Letter to Cardinal Panzirolo*, p. 377.

† Ibid., p. 380.

an unhappy position.”* He further says in his first letter to the Supreme Council, that as it is the nature of a truce that all things are to remain in the state in which they are, from the time it is made until it expires, it would be most injurious to make a truce at that time, considering the dreadful state in which religion was in Munster, after the devastations committed by Inchiquin during the autumn and winter—the destruction of churches and the banishment of priests. And from the weakness of the army against the Catholics, and even of the Parliament forces, it was reasonable to hope, the Nuncio thought, that the Catholics could gain what they had lost in Munster. Besides, there was some respect due to public opinion, and the honour of the Confederate Catholics; and it was known as a public fact to all Europe, that Inchiquin had devastated the city of Cashel, and committed horrible sacrileges within the church of St. Patrick, where many priests and even women were slain at the altar. He exacted at the same time heavy contributions from the inhabitants; and at length proceeded to the very walls of Kilkenny, whence his presence was announced to the Supreme Council. Surely, no one, he adds, could suppose the power of the Catholics so weakened, as to make it a necessity for them to conclude a truce with such a violent enemy, after having inflicted so many calamities upon them.

The reply of the Supreme Council to the above is based on the inability of the Confederation to fight Inchiquin, and their other enemies at the same time. Even, they say, if they were able to put an army in the field, which Inchiquin thought himself too weak to encounter, he had fortified towns with provisions to retire to, in which they would not be in a position to besiege him. Again, when they would be engaged with Inchiquin, the Parliamentarians in Leinster, Ulster, and Connaught would not, of course, remain idle, but would overrun Leinster and Connaught, whilst the Confederate army was in pursuit of Inchiquin, who in the King's great difficulties had embraced his cause. And they put it to the Nuncio, if their agents could expect or have the face to ask favours or good terms from the Queen and Prince of Wales, if the Catholics withdrew their hostility from the Parliamentarians, and turned it against the supporters of the King. With regard to the above charge made by Inchiquin against the Nuncio, the Supreme Council say, in their first reply to him, that “a few weeks previously a certain Galfred Barron conveyed to them his (the Nuncio's) opinion, that if their affairs fell into

* Abstract of reasons against the truce with Inchiquin. *Embassy in Ireland*, p. 387.

such great difficulties [as to make it necessary]* they ought to conclude a truce with this self-same Baron Inchiquin who now proposed it of his own accord, and at the same time turning over to the Royal cause, a fact which he had proved by this unmistakable sign,—that he imprisoned some of his principal officers, because they would not attach themselves to the side of his Majesty.” In a second letter the Nuncio explains that in his communication of the 1st of March, to which reference was made, he did not favour either a truce or armistice with the Scots or Inchiquin, or any others. What he meant was that an accommodation might be come to; and his reason for the distinction was, that in a truce things must stand during its continuance as they stood when it was made, but that an arrangement or accommodation could not be concluded, unless the contracting parties gained some advantage from it, and that as many members of the Supreme Council could testify, such an arrangement or accommodation was always favoured and wished for by him, when any advantage was to be gained, but that he was against approving of any truce or cessation whatever.†

Other points are discussed in the letters, but the above are the principal.

In those letters there is a good deal of fencing and special pleading, but the motives of both parties are plain enough; the Supreme Council, now completely in Ormonde’s interest, were determined to close with Inchiquin in order to make a combination strong enough to crush the Nuncio and O’Neill; whilst the Nuncio, seeing clearly through their design, endeavoured to frustrate it, but in this he failed, because the Supreme Council took care to have the truce so nearly ratified before his arrival in Kilkenny, that it could not be set aside or altered.‡

The Nuncio finding all his efforts to prevent the truce with Inchiquin to be fruitless, left Kilkenny privately in the beginning of May, and proceeded to O’Neill, who was then at Maryborough. On the 27th of that month, he published an excommunication against all who would accept the truce. He removed from Maryborough to Athlone, whence on the 13th of June he wrote to Cardinal Panzirolo as follows:—“The Council, bent on mis-

* “Quod si res nostra tantis essent in angustiis, inducias faciendas esse cum hoc ipso Barone de Inchiquin.”

† For this correspondence, see *Billings’ Vindiciæ*, from p. 60 to p. 86.

‡ “I came to Kilkenny, being every day solicited to do so by the Supreme Council, that I might be present at the conclusion of the truce with Inchiquin, of which I have already written; but found that, as usual, these gentlemen had all but completed it, although they had written they should do nothing without me.” Nuncio’s Letter to Card. Panzirolo, from Kilkenny, 3rd May, 1648.—*Embassy in Ireland*, p. 381.

chief, have finally concluded the truce with Inchiquin, upon much worse conditions than when the clergy protested against it; and at the same time Preston, at the head of 3,000 infantry, proposed to join Inchiquin and Taaffe to the detriment of O'Neill. Upon this I have published the strictest form of excommunication against him, and by the first opportunity to Rome, I shall send all the necessary documents relating to the subject, and especially my reasons for coming to this determination, rather than allow affairs to take their course. Hell is working with all its powers—some bishops and many monks have declared against me, chiefly amongst the Jesuits, who insist that the censure as resting on temporal affairs is null and void, and that it can be suspended by an appeal made by the Council; although this power of suspension is not admitted by me; some even go so far as to say, that by the English law I have no authority to exercise jurisdiction.”*

On the 31st of May the Supreme Council appealed, in form, against the excommunication, although the power of appeal from it was specially excluded by the Nuncio. A copy of this appeal was delivered to him at Kilcolgan on the 5th of June, to which he replied on the same day, giving six months for the prosecution of the appeal, but refusing to suspend the effects of the excommunication in the meantime.† The bishops and the rest of the clergy were divided about the Nuncio's power of pronouncing an excommunication under the circumstances in which he did so. The Council, of course, followed the opinion of those who adhered to them, in disregarding the excommunication, and in appealing against it.

The truce between Inchiquin and the Supreme Council having been concluded, the combination against the Nuncio and O'Neill was complete. Taaffe and Clanrickard prepared an expedition against them, to aid which Inchiquin despatched five hundred horse under the command of one Major Doily.‡ On receiving this reinforcement Preston marched with all expedition towards Kilcolgan, the residence of Terence Coghlan, where the Nuncio was known to be then staying, but on this occasion as on many others, he arrived too late, and “was informed that My Lord Nuncio last night in a disguised manner, went unto the Shannon, where his lordship was expected with a boat and a dozen musketiers to ferie and guard him to Athlone, from Captain Gawley, and by the appointment of the Catholicke General, to prevent

* Letter to Cardinal Panzirolo.—*Embassy in Ireland*, p. 393.

† Aphor. Discovery, Vol. I., p. 199.

‡ Carte says 600.

such a danger, as previdinge (foreseeing) the like might happen.”*

After his disappointment at Kilcolgan, Preston went towards Athlone, having sent a party of horse before him “with commands (says the Author of the *Aphorismical Discovery*), to use all Ulstermen, keraghts, and others, whether in arms or noe, that they meet, with fire and sword, noe qualitie or sex exempted.” There were at the time keraghts and sutlers going towards Athlone, where O'Neill was, with cows and other provisions, but Preston's horse having got between them and O'Neill's camp, seized all the supplies they carried, killing many of them, not sparing age or sex. “This,” says the author quoted above, with bitter scorn, “was the first field that Preston ever gott[won] in Ireland.”† Preston pitched his camp within a mile or two of O'Neill, in the vicinity of Athlone, where many skirmishes occurred between their troops, but there was no regular engagement. After about three weeks, O'Neill retired from Athlone to Jamestown, for want of provisions, leaving a garrison under Theobald M. Magauley, to defend the place. It was here, on the 28th of June, 1648, that O'Neill, in conjunction with his officers, published his Declaration against the Cessation with Inchiquin. It is a remarkable document, and quite worthy of the Catholic General. He begins it by flinging aside with disdain the calumny so often uttered against him that he was wanting in loyalty to his sovereign; but whilst he does so, he cannot forget that he is bound by the Oath of Association. “We have,” he says, “by free and full consent, without any reluctancy, in the view of the world, taken the Oath of Association appointed by universall votes to be taken by all the Confederate Catholics of Ireland, wherein we manifest our religion towards God, and secure our loyaltie towards our sovereigne. This oath we have as frequently and as freely iterated as any of the rest of our fellow-Confederates in this kingdom. We have also avowed that solemn protestation made by the Catholick Clergie of the same Confederacy, protesting to give unto Cæsar what is due to Cæsar, and to God what is due to God; as we resolve never to violate this oath and protestation, so do we resolve never to adhere unto any that have or shall endeavour to suppress the one or the other. Such as boast most of loyaltie, but are most conscious of disloyaltie, have by this Cessation given unto the king's sworn enemy two intire Counties in Munster, which were in the possession of the Confederate Catholics, without receiving any assurance of his loyaltie

* Aphor. Discovery, Vol. I., p. 209. See also Borlase, p. 245.

† Ibid., Vol. I., pp. 209, 228.

or restitution of the same Counties after the expiration of the Cessation.”* O’Neill accuses the Confederation of adhering to Ormonde, notwithstanding his treachery in delivering to the Parliament (the king’s greatest enemies), “the Castles of Dublin, Drogheda, Trim, Dundalke, and all other garrisons remaining in his quarters.” “Yet those men would needs be held loyall subjects, and all others who oppose their sinister practices (though thereunto bound by oath) must be held disloyal.” . . . “We provoake [challenge] the whole world to charge us with the least act of disloyaltie committed since these commotions, unless the depraved judgments of the disloyal (to cloake the turpitude of their own crimes) will censure it disloyaltie in us to defend with Christian resolution the freedome of our religion, the prerogatives of our Sovereigne, and liberty of our free-born nation, whereunto by oath we are obliged. Unto the perfect observance of this oath and protestation, the See Apostolick by its Apostolick Missions frequently exhorted us, and to second our endeavours therein hath sent unto the Catholick Confederates frequent subsidies. So far is it from truth that either His Holiness or we are against the allegiance due by subjects unto their Sovereigne. Unto those who truly and really adhere unto His Majestie (without prejudicing our religion) we do and shall adhere Unto others who only counterfeit such adherence to avoid the forces of the Confederate Catholicks, we may not adhere. We conjure all the Confederate Catholicks together, with those faithful subjects (of what religion soever) that unfeignedly adhere to his Majestie, to join with us against all Parliamentary rebels and all factionists who (for their own ends) complie with them, to the violation of their oath, prejudice of our Sovereigne, and desire of the distressed nation. Signed by the General and Commander at Athlone, 17 June, 1648 [old style.]

“Owen O’Neill, Owen Maguire, Con O’Neill, Henry O’Neill, Lisagh O’More, Bryan O’Neill, Philip O’Reilly, James McDonnell, Arthur Fox, Myles MacSwiney, Phelim [MacTuhill] O’Neill, Owen O’Dogharty.”†

Having remained in Athlone some time, the Nuncio proceeded to Galway, where he must have arrived in the last days of June, or first of July, as he wrote from that city to Cardinal Panzirolo on the 2nd of the latter month. In this letter he says:—“The plot to restore the former state of affairs was well laid, and upon

* Aphorismal Discovery, Vol. I., p. 741.

† The above signatures do not appear in the copy in the Carte Papers, and are taken from the *Hibernia Dominicana*, *Aphor. Disc.*, pp. 741, 2 and 3, Vol. I.

the declaration of the bishops against the truce, the Council, in spite of promises to the contrary, concluded their iniquitous stipulations, placed Preston at the head of a hastily raised army, and sent him against General Owen O'Neill, the supporter of the clergy. I was in despair, believing that I must either fly the kingdom, or witness the overthrow of the Catholic army, the desolation of the Church, and the triumph of the last year's rejected peace. No remedy was to be found for these evils, and at last I took courage to publish an interdict against all who should acknowledge or favour the truce, or unite with the heretics against those who opposed it."*

The Mayor of Galway was, according to Carte, anxious to proclaim the Cessation, but was prevented by the people. The Nuncio called a Synod to meet at Galway on the 15th of August, but the Supreme Council forbade the clergy to proceed to that city, and commanded all civil and military officers to stop their passage thither. By this means the assembling of a Synod was prevented. The Nuncio, moreover, was besieged in Galway by Clanrickard, *who had been made commander of the Confederate forces in Connaught*, and who beleaguered Galway so closely that he effectually prevented the sending of provisions into the city either by land or water, and thus reduced the inhabitants to such a state that they were forced to proclaim the Cessation, pay a considerable sum of money, and renounce the Nuncio and his adherents.†

The Supreme Council (Ormondites), having, as Carte says, laid their plans better than on former occasions, were now in the ascendant, and so were able to pursue the course they had marked out for themselves. On the 30th of September they publicly proclaimed O'Neill a rebel and a traitor,‡ and proceeded to draw up a series of charges against the Nuncio, accusing him of "manifold oppressions, transcendent crimes, and capital offences, which he had been continually for three years past acting within the kingdom, to the unspeakable detriment of their religion, the ruin of the nation, and the dishonour of the See of Rome, which suffered much by his actions and proceedings in the Nunciature." They further warned him to prepare for his journey to Rome, in order to defend himself against the charges they were about to make against him, and to do so under the penalty which might ensue by the laws of God and Nations; and further, that he was not by himself, or his adherents,

* Embassy in Ireland, p. 401.

† Carte, Vol. II., pp. 35-6.

‡ Aphorism. Discovery, Vol. I., pp. 747 and 749.

"directly or indirectly to intermeddle in any of the affairs of the kingdom of Ireland."*

Notwithstanding this insulting message, the Nuncio remained some months in Galway, in the hope that affairs might take some favourable turn, but unfortunately they did not, so on the 23rd of February, 1649, he went on board the *S. Pietro*, and set sail from Ireland on the 2nd of March, after having been three years and four months in this country.†

When Rinuccini, Prince and Archbishop of Fermo, was accredited to the Irish Catholics as Nuncio, he did not, and of course could not, realize the difficulties of the task imposed upon him. At that time there were about ten Catholics to one Protestant in this country, so the Nuncio naturally regarded it as a Catholic nation; but the Protestants, though so few in number, because they became possessors of the land by confiscation, and because they were sustained by the power of England, looked on themselves as the nation, and regarded the Catholics, especially those of Irish race, as inferior beings and enemies, who had lost all claim to live on Irish soil, and were, therefore, to be got rid of as opportunity offered. With this state of things the Nuncio was, to some extent, acquainted; but surely he could not have been prepared for the feelings and sympathies which influenced the conduct of the Irish Catholics of English descent. To be

* Carte, Vol. II., p. 43, and Vol. III., p. 585. Sir Richard Blake's letter to the Nuncio, dated 19th October, 1648. Sir R. Blake was, at this time, Chairman of the General Assembly.

† Carte says he went on board the *S. Pietro* on the 22nd of February, but what seems to have happened is that he went on board early on the morning of the 23rd, which Carte calls the 22nd. The date in the "Confederation of Kilkenny," by Rev. C. P. Meehan, is *January* 23rd, but *January* is an evident misprint for *February*. See Carte, Vol. II., p. 56; *Hibernica Dominicana*, p. 687; *Confederation of Kilkenny*, p. 270. *Ed.* 1882. Although importuned by many to remain in Ireland, the Nuncio had become so straitened for the means to support himself, that he became very anxious to take his departure. "Being despoiled," he writes, "of everything which I possessed, under various and unjust pretexts, I find it difficult to support myself." He was necessitated to sell his frigate, the *San Pietro*, to a merchant, with the condition that he was to have the right of a passage in her when leaving Ireland. His intention was to land in some port of Flanders, but the merchant was afraid to land at Ostende, on account of his difference with the Spanish agent. He feared the Parliamentary ships in the Channel, so he made for Havre-de-Grace, but encountering contrary winds, he was obliged to cast anchor at a "miserable village of Normandy," called St. Vasto. The people of Galway paid the Nuncio great respect at his departure. Writing to Cardinal Panzirolo, he says:—"Your Eminence cannot conceive the affection of the citizens of Galway at this crisis; they ridiculed these attempts [to expel him by force], and showed such reverence for the Holy See as to be prepared to defend me by arms, if necessary. The triumph of my departure when I was accompanied to the ship by the tears and lamentations of the people was greater than when I disembarked three years ago."—*The Embassy in Ireland, passim.*

sure they rose up and armed against the persecution inflicted upon them on account of their religion; but they had another grievance which excited their anger quite as much as the first, which was, that the English Government began to regard and treat them in some degree as mere Irish, instead of looking on them as English residing in Ireland. The Catholics of English blood possessed the anti-Irish feeling almost as much as the Protestants; although the identity of faith somewhat toned down their dislike and contempt for the natives. The Nuncio at first thought the battle was one of religion only, but by degrees he discovered his error, and found that the Catholic Generals and Catholic leaders of the Pale were more inclined to follow the apostate Ormonde than any who represented the true Catholic spirit of Ireland.

The Nuncio, coming from Italy, and imbued with the ideas that prevailed there as well as in other Catholic nations, assumed as a matter of course, that what the Catholics of Ireland had a perfect right to, and what they took up arms to assert, was perfect equality—perfect freedom of religious worship; whilst the protestants regarded it as nothing short of insolent audacity in them to think of putting forward any such claim, and in fact looked on the scantiest toleration as far too much to grant them. The Nuncio, besides, was no match for Ormonde in the diplomatic management of affairs, for which he was not to be blamed, as there was hardly any man of his time who could compete with the Marquis in patient, unceasing, and well contrived political intriguing. We may call it statesmanship or anything else we please, but his power in that line cannot for a moment be denied—a power by which he not only kept the protestants well in hand, but filled the General Assembly and the Supreme Council with Catholics, ever ready to carry out his plans. The Catholic Generals whenever they fought against him or his known views were so often defeated, that they became suspected more of treachery than incompetence. Such being the situation of affairs, the Nuncio at last had nothing to sustain him but Owen Roe's army, and his own power as a churchman. He is accused of having been too ready to employ excommunications and interdicts. Perhaps so; but be it remembered that it was only when those who bound themselves by oath never to lay down their arms until their religion was free, forgot their oath, nay, broke it, by making-secret compacts with Ormonde, the worst enemy of the Catholic cause, that the Nuncio, as a last resort, had recourse to interdict and excommunication against the supporters of the truce with Inchiquin. It was an act which few would approve of for our time; but the

actions of men must be judged by the times in which they lived, and the circumstances by which they were surrounded.

Much odium has been cast upon the Nuncio on account of his opposition to the peace of '46, which was so highly extolled by the Ormondites. The peace of '46, no doubt, offered some good concessions, but it was leavened with Ormonde's usual duplicity. Surely, the full legal recognition of the Catholic religion was essential to the making of any peace with Ormonde. It was to secure such recognition that the Catholics had armed. But in the peace of '46 his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects were referred "to his Majesty's gracious favour, and further concessions." There was no real recognition of them, although they were offered certain privileges. Besides, the Nuncio and those who acted with him were abundantly justified by the terms of the Oath of Association in rejecting the peace of '46,* whilst neither the King nor Ormonde had the power of carrying out the conditions of the peace of '46 or '48-9, had either been accepted.

Carte, one of the chief authorities on the war of 1641 is most unjust to the Nuncio, and what makes his injustice more wicked and dangerous is the air of impartiality which he assumes. Unfortunately some Catholic writers and many Catholic readers, deceived by those who had in their hands the making of the history of 1641 and following years, have formed an opinion of the Nuncio quite too unfavourable and not at all deserved. Carte and his imitators can hardly see a blemish in Ormonde, whilst *the mere fact of being opposed to him* is, with them, a fault in all others. It may be that the Nuncio was too sanguine as to what could be done for the Catholic Church in Ireland. He was probably more impulsive, and certainly less astute than Ormonde; but that he fulfilled his mission in Ireland most conscientiously, with no mean ability and with immense labour, will be evident to every historical student of the period. Success covers a multitude of faults. Had the Nuncio won, his very enemies would, it is more than probable, see high qualities, where they can now see nothing but faults and shortcomings. One duty is plain at any rate—those for whom he thought and fought and laboured so long ought to defend his memory from the unjust obloquy which has been sought to be cast upon it.†

* See p. 166. See also the articles in full in Cox, Appendix xxiv.† Also those of the Peace of '48-9, *ib.* xliii.

† The following short extracts will show the spirit in which the historians of the War of 1641, wrote of the Nuncio:—

"He had carried himself with the appearance of temper till the congregation

His enemies did not cease to calumniate the Nuncio after he had left Ireland. Borlase says that when he arrived in Rome "he had an ill reception of the Pope, who said to him *Temerariè te gessisti*."* This saying rests on the word of a certain friar O'Callaghan, said to have been a disappointed suitor to the Nuncio for the bishoprick of Cork, and is not sustained by facts. Again, Carte says "the Court of Rome, though it was contrary to their maxims to fix a public mark of censure upon the conduct of their ministers, disapproving of his [the Nuncio's] conduct, sent him orders to make haste thither."† For this statement Carte gives no authority whatever, and so far from the Pope having censured the Nuncio, he was most graciously received by the Holy Father, as appears from the following passage:—"In the meantime Innocent X. had been informed both by letters from the Nuncio himself, and also from the bishops and other persons of respectability in Ireland, of his negotiations and continued struggle against the enemies of the Church,

of Waterford; but ever since that time his conduct had been a continued series of violent and unreasonable actions, arbitrary and obstinate measures, directed by ambitious views, and tending to the division of the Confederates, and the ruin of the kingdom."—*Carte's Ormonde, fol. Ed., Vol. II., p. 34.*

[It was Ormonde who applied himself to divide the Confederates, in which, unfortunately, he was but too successful.]

"When he had with less success than formerly issued his excommunication, the 27th of May, 1648, against all those who complied with the Cessation with the Lord Inchiquin, he was compelled in the end, after so much mischief done to the religion he was obliged to protect, in an obscure manner, to fly out of the kingdom, and coming to Rome," &c.—*Borlase's History of the Execrable Rebellion, &c., Dublin Ed., 1763, p. 246.*

[It is highly amusing to find Borlase relating, with apparent regret, the mischief done by the Nuncio to the Catholic religion in Ireland.]

When the Cessation was concluded with Inchiquin, "the Nuncio," says Leland, "was enraged even to a degree of phrenzy. He fled secretly from Kilkenny, and cast himself into the arms of his favourite, O'Neill, whom he conjured to march without delay against the prophane betrayers of the Church."—*History of Ireland, 4to Ed., p. 325.*

"Because the impudent injustice and imprudence of the Nuncio, and the subjection of the people to his immoderate and imprudent humour and spirit was, in truth, the real fountain from whence this torrent of calamities flowed, which hath since overwhelmed that miserable nation, and because that exorbitant power of his was resolutely opposed by Catholics of the most eminent parts and interests," &c.—*Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in Ireland. Dublin Ed., 1719-20, p. 61.*

* History of the Execrable Rebellion, p. 246. This expression of the Holy Father, charging Rinuccini with rashness, has been many times reproduced by his enemies. De Burgo could not be induced to believe it was uttered, for if it were, the members of his Order, he says, would have been there at once and without difficulty freed from the Anathema [meaning the Interdict] under which they suffered, which they were not. His words are:—"Si enim id verum esset, cito et haud difficulter ab Anathemate isto liberarentur Nostrates, cujus tamen, contrarium ex mox narrandis clarebit."—*Hibernia Dominicana, p. 690.*

† Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 56.

and received him with fraternal tenderness, expressed his full satisfaction, and highly commended his prudence, zeal, and Apostolic self-denial. The Pope would have wished to retain him near himself as Pontifical preacher, but Rinuccini respectfully refused the honour, alleging as an excuse his failing health which needed repose ; but in reality he desired to return to his See, and to assist in person in the pastoral care of his chosen flock, who longed no less to see again their beloved pastor.”*

He had landed in Normandy before the middle of March, 1649, but did not arrive in Rome until the 8th of November of the same year, which shows there was no pressure put upon him to hasten his journey to the Eternal City, as Carte asserts. Before his departure from Ireland the General Assembly had prepared an appeal against the excommunication, which they despatched to Rome by Father John Roe, a discalced Carmelite (*unshod* is Carte’s word), who arrived on the 16th of January, 1649. He was Provincial of his Order at the time. The Nuncio having been informed of this proceeding, sent his confessor, Father Joseph Arcamoni, a Theatine, and Father Richard O’Farrell, a Capuchin, to represent and defend him ; and he wrote to Cardinal Panzirolo, requesting him to await the arrival of those fathers before any investigation of the excommunication or appeal should be entered upon. He adds :—“ Since I wrote the above, I find that the Assembly have declared me a rebel against the Crown of England, and are determined to expel me the kingdom. I am quite ready to bear this, and esteem it a glory, although they have taken from me all that I have.”†

The Nuncio’s representatives arrived in Rome not long after Father Rowe. On their arrival they besought the authorities to postpone the business until the Nuncio himself would be in Rome, and up to December, 1649, nothing seems to have been done. This we learn from a letter attributed to Abbizzi, Secretary of the Congregation of Cardinals, who had charge of Irish affairs. That the appeal from the Ormonde party against the excommunication failed to have any effect, we may infer from the fact that permission for its removal was not granted until the next pontificate, which was that of Alexander the VII., as is thus recorded by Sir James Ware in his annals : “ Anno 1665. In this year Pope Alexander the Seventh absolved the Irish from the excommunication of the Nuncio upon their doing penance.”

* Memoir of Rinuccini by G. Aiazza, Librarian of the Rinuccini Library, prefixed to the Embassy in Ireland, p. x.

† *The Embassy in Ireland*, p. 423,

CHAPTER XVI.

HAVING concluded the accounts of the Nuncio's connection with Irish affairs it is now necessary to go back a little.

The Marquis of Ormonde left Ireland with the full intention of returning as soon as the course of events would make it prudent for him to do so. The retirement, or rather the retreat of the Nuncio from Kilkenny, the transformation of the General Assembly into an Ormondite faction from being the Catholic Confederation, the defection of Inchiquin from the Parliament and his truce with the Assembly, seemed to Ormonde's mind to usher in a desirable time for resuming his government in Ireland. On the 21st of September, 1648, the Queen dispatched Sir G. Hamilton from St. Germain's to Havre with her final instructions to the Marquis, who had already arrived there and was awaiting them. Having received these, he set sail with the next favourable wind, accompanied by a retinue of about one hundred persons, amongst whom were the Earls of Roscommon and Castlehaven, and his brother, Richard Butler.* He arrived in Cork on the 29th of the same month; whence he almost immediately proceeded to the Castle of Carrick-on-Suir, in order to be nearer to Kilkenny, and thus be enabled to hurry on the Peace with the General Assembly, which had become of urgent necessity to the King's interest. Carrick Castle belonged to Ormonde, but was then in Inchiquin's possession, although within the Catholic quarters. Ormonde was received in Cork by Inchiquin's Major-General, Inchiquin himself being engaged in an expedition against O'Neill. Inchiquin, in his letters to Ormonde inviting him to return to Ireland, was very pressing as to the necessity of bringing over money to pay his (Inchiquin's) army. The lowest sum that would suffice, he said, was £6,000, but all that Ormonde could obtain from the Queen was 3,600 pistoles, a sum not much over £1,500;† and this was spent in his journey to Ireland, except a mere trifle; so that, says Carte, he arrived at Cork with only thirty pistoles in his pocket. But he followed the advice given to him by Inchiquin, and pretended that he

* The Nuncio in a letter to Cardinal Panzirolo, says Secretary Digby was of the party.

† The pistole meant here, no doubt, was that containing eleven old French livres, being about equal to 8s. 6d. of our money.

brought with him draughts on various merchants in different Irish cities, hoping that the time supposed to be necessary for getting them cashed, would be sufficient to enable him to raise money by other means. But the money to pay the army was not forthcoming within what they considered a reasonable time, so they became disorganized and mutinous. Alarmed at this state of things, Inchiquin sent for Ormonde. This was done, it was said, to pacify them; but what Inchiquin clearly wanted was to bring Ormonde face to face with the army, and then and there obtain from him such a public promise as would satisfy officers and men. This was most necessary, for there was imminent danger of their breaking up altogether—some to go to Jones, others to join O'Neill. Ormonde had nothing substantial to offer, but luckily for him, at the critical moment a Mr. Fanshaw* landed with instructions and despatches from the Prince of Wales, and with assurances that the fleet was coming to those parts with a supply of ammunition and provisions for the army, and that the Prince himself was preparing to come to Ireland. This seemed to satisfy the troops, but their satisfaction was more apparent than real, for it was afterwards discovered that some of the officers had opened negotiations with the Parliament, and had sent it certain propositions in the name of the Army of Munster. The plot was discovered in time to be crushed.

Ormonde having remained twenty days at Carrick Castle, moved on to Kilkenny as soon as the preparations made for his reception were complete; and it was from that city he had been obliged, much against his will, to go back to Cork to try to content Inchiquin's soldiers. He and his friends had determined that his advent to Kilkenny should be a grand demonstration. He entered that city with regal splendour. Such members of the General Assembly as could be got together, with many of the gentry of the surrounding country, awaited his arrival, and when they had notice of his approach, they rode out a distance of some ten miles to meet him. After entering the city he was conducted to the Castle, which was formally handed over to him by the Mayor and Aldermen. Then he ascended a lofty throne, which had been erected for him, and when he had taken his seat he was requested by John Burke, Archbishop of Tuam, and Thomas Walsh, Archbishop of Cashel, in the name of those present, to resume the government of the kingdom, and to raise it from the wretched condition in which it then was.† To this

* This was probably a piece of mismanagement on the part of Ormonde.

† Archbishop Walsh appears to have been a good well-meaning prelate. He gained little by his reception of Ormonde. From a letter written by him in

request Ormonde gave, as he well knew how to give, a benign, dignified assent. He declared the Confederation dissolved, and then formed a Council out of some of its members, amongst whom he named French, Bishop of Ferns, *on the express condition* that he would drop his title, and for the future sign himself Nicholas only.*

Ormonde proceeded at once to conclude a peace with the General Assembly, but it was retarded by his reluctance to yield to all their demands, although they were very moderate. He also fell sick, and his illness, which lasted some weeks, was a further cause of delay. The Marquis had a knack of falling sick, when he thought there was anything to be gained by delay. His illness on this occasion was most opportune, for during it, events occurred in England which made all parties in Ireland anxious to have a peace concluded. "It happened at this time," says Carte, "that the Remonstrance of the army in England on November 16, being brought over to Lord Inchiquin was reprinted by him at Cork, and sent to Kilkenny, as proper to raise in all parties of men, the utmost abhorrence of the proceedings of those successful rebels, who now publicly avowed their design of subverting everything that had hitherto been known for government in these nations. It had a wonderful effect in Ireland; it not only silenced all complaints in the Protestant army, but it removed all difficulties which the Roman Catholics, in zeal for their Religion, had thrown in the way of peace. The Assembly receded from their demands in that point, and on December 28th,

December, 1650, "e refugio nostro," it appears that the troops of the Baron of Inchiquin, that bitter foe to religion, three times plundered the Cathedral and the Archbishop's house at Cashel. After the capture of Limerick, the Archbishop was compelled to go into exile, and was carried from his bed, to which he had been confined by age and sickness, from Clonmel to Waterford, and was inhumanly put on board a ship bound for Spain, without being provided with proper food and the appliances necessary for his condition.—*Propaganda*. Quoted in Brady's *Episcopal Succession*, Vol. II., p. 24.

John de Burgo, or Burke, was translated from the See of Clonfert to the Archbishoprick of Tuam in March, 1647. The Nuncio writing to Cardinal Pamphilio in December, 1645, says, John de Burgo was "a man of mature judgment and upright intentions;" and in August, 1646, he says "he considered him in every way worthy of the Archbishoprick." *Episcopal Succession*, Vol. II., p. 144. Later on he had cause to change his opinion, for John of Tuam, and his brother, Hugh of Kilmaeduaigh, both Clanrickard's relations, gave him annoyance, *ib.* 145. The Archbishop with his suffragan, Kirwan of Killala, and Lynch of Kilfenora had the gates of St. Nicholas broken open, and celebrated within it, in spite of the interdict.—*Confederation of Kilkenny*, p. 267.

* Carte, Vol. II., p. 45. Aphor. Discovery, Vol. I., p. 283. The Archbishop of Tuam was admitted to become a member of the Council on the same condition.—*Embassy in Ireland*, p. 460.

‘upon consideration of his Majesty’s present condition, and their own hearty desires of spending their lives and fortunes in maintaining his rights and interests, they resolved unanimously to accept of the Marquis of Ormonde’s answer to their propositions for religion.’”* The terms of peace having been at length arranged, they were solemnly ratified in Kilkenny Castle, on the 17th of January, 1649, just thirteen days before the man with whom the peace was made was beheaded at Whitehall.† This Peace was substantially and almost *verbatim* the same as that of ’46. Where any difference exists between them the peace of ’49 is fuller and clearer than that of ’46.

As soon as the news of the King’s death reached Ormonde, he had the Prince proclaimed king in such towns as owned his authority. He hoped that having driven the Nuncio from Ireland he would be able to make such a combination, political and military, as would enable him to hold the country for Charles II.; but this was no easy task to accomplish, and Ormonde, with all his tact and ability, found it too much for him. In the first instance he made overtures to O’Neill through his nephew, Daniel O’Neill. Ormonde was very anxious to get O’Neill to join him, because he had a high opinion of his honour and his great military talents, and because he knew the Ulster people would follow his lead, so that with the Confederate forces, his own, and O’Neill’s, he hoped to be strong enough to make successful head against the Parliament. O’Neill was in great straits at this time, and must of necessity come to terms with one or other of the contending parties. In the end of the Spring of 1648 it became known that the Supreme Council, Ormonde and Inchiquin, had agreed to the preliminaries of a peace—the peace just referred to as having been finally settled in January, 1649. Upon this, more than half O’Neill’s army, following the advice and example of their commanders, deserted him; those commanders were *such as had been in possession of their estates when the rising took place in 1641*, and no doubt hoped by joining Ormonde now to be reinstated in them. The most important of them were:—Sir Phelim O’Neill, Lord Iveagh, Alexander McDonnell, Bryan McColl McMahon,

* Carte’s Ormonde, fol. Ed., Vol. II., p. 49. The Remonstrance of the Army above referred to was presented to the Commons by the officers against any further treaty with Charles, and required that he and his adherents be brought to justice.—*Wade’s British Chronology*, p. 194. Some days later a Remonstrance was presented from the Army “to bring the King to justice.” Cromwell was the prime mover in these Remonstrances, *ib.*

† The warrant for the King’s execution was signed by fifty-nine of his judges. Cromwell’s name is third on the list.

Myles O'Reilly, Hugh Boy O'Donnell, Torlogh O'Neill McHenry, Art McHugh Boy O'Neill (both of the Fues), and Daniel Oge Magennis, uncle to Lord Iveagh.*

Weak as O'Neill's army had become by the defection of his leading adherents, he sent a dignified and manly reply to Ormonde's overtures. "The distance," he says, "your Excellencie finds me at with the rest of the Confederates, is occasioned by my obligation to defend his Holiness, his Nuncio, and the rest of the clergy that adhered to him, and myself too, from the violence and indiscretion of some of the Council that were at Kilkenny, as the agents which now I send to the Assembly will clearly make appeare. As for the treaty which your Excellencie hath begun with the Assembly, if it end with the satisfaction of the clergie in point of religion, and of the rest of the Assembly in what concerns the common interest of the nation, and the safety and advantage of the poore provinces which intrusted me with their arms, I shall with much joy and gladness submit to the conclusion of it; for these are the ends which made mee quit the good condition I was in abroad, with a great deal of trouble to myselfe, and expense of my fortune heere."

O'Neill then proceeded to state the conditions on which he would join Ormonde. He demanded to have his post of General confirmed to him, independently of any authority but that of the Lord Lieutenant; and that an army of 6,000 foot and 800 horse might be maintained to serve under him, at the general charge of the kingdom, if the appointment in Ulster failed owing to expense. Ormonde was quite willing to yield to O'Neill's demands, including that one about the number of troops he was to have under him, but the Commissioners, who were old members of the Supreme Council, and were the sole judges of the number of troops the country was able to maintain, would allow O'Neill only 4,000 foot and 600 horse. He was provoked at this, and so no agreement was made with Ormonde. Afterwards, I believe through Ormonde's influence, and not for the reasons given by Carte, the Commissioners consented to give Owen the full number of men he had demanded, provided he would accept amongst them Lord Iveagh's, Sir Phelim O'Neill's and Alexander McDonnell's regiments, all of whom had deserted from him, and in whose company he did not believe his life would be safe. This was the greatest affront of all, and, says

* See a Journal of the most Memorable Transactions of General Owen O'Neill and his party, from the year 1640 to the year 1650. Faithfully related by Colonel Henry M'Tully O'Neill, who served under him. *Desiderata Curiosa Hibernica*, p. 511. Also a History of the Warr in Ireland by a British Officer in Sir J. Clottworthy's Regiment, p. 69.

Carte, "he resolved to show them their mistake, and rejected the conditions proposed."*

The Commissioners constituted what was called the "Interval Government." When the General Assembly and the Supreme Council were dissolved, some power became necessary to continue the work the Council had been doing, and in some sort to represent them; so Ormonde and Inchiquin laid their heads together, and out of their consultation sprang the Interval Government, or, in other words, "The Commissioners of Trust," who substantially continued the powers of the defunct Supreme Council. They were† associated in the government with Ormonde, and were all creatures of his.

It would appear that O'Neill had some private communications with Michael Jones, even before his correspondence with Ormonde. Such was his condition for some time, that it had become an urgent necessity with him to join some party. His army was greatly reduced; he had no ammunition; and every general in the field was at the head of a force hostile to him. It seems to be also the fact that he addressed himself to the Parliamentary party in England, through one Abbot Crilly, who had been with the Marquis of Antrim in Paris, and offered them his services, "if they [his party] might obtain indemnity for what was passed, and assurance of the enjoyments of their religion and estates for the time to come." The Parliamentary Council appointed General Ludlow and some others to confer with this agent, which they accordingly did, and in due time reported that in their opinion O'Neill's demands should not be granted. In this the Council agreed, and so the agent was dismissed.‡

On the 8th of May, O'Neill concluded a truce with Colonel Monk, then holding Dundalk for the Parliament.§ By the fifth article Monck was to give "free leave and liberty" that any ship or ships arriving in any harbour or port-town within the said Colonel Monk's jurisdiction, with arms or ammunition or

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 57. The Commissioners, who hated O'Neill, acted as above related more to spite him than to serve any interest.

† They were twelve in number, viz., Viscounts Dillon and Muskery, Lord Athenry, Alex. McDonnell, Sir Lucas Dillon, Sir N. Plunket, Sir Richard Barnewall, Geoffrey Browne, Donogh O'Callaghan, Tirlagh O'Neill, Miles O'Reilly, and Gerald Fennell. I follow Carte in this list of names; the one in the Aphorism. Discovery is somewhat different.

‡ Ludlow's Memoirs, p. 294. Swiss Ed. 1698.

§ Five days after his agreement with Monk, O'Neill wrote to the Dean of Ferns and Rinuccini that he abhorred joining the faction of the Supreme Council, or those in power in Dublin, but that unless he got some aid he would be necessitated to join one or the other.

other commodities for O'Neill, should be admitted; that he, O'Neill, be allowed to carry such supplies away; and that the ships bringing such things be permitted to depart without any prejudice, at their will and pleasure.* Besides the power of landing ammunition and stores in Dundalk, O'Neill obtained from Monk a supply of powder and "match proportionable," of which he was in much need, and for which he despatched a convoy of 500 foot and 300 horse, under the command of General O'Ferrall; but Inchiquin, who, after taking Drogheda, was on his way to Dundalk, having got intelligence of this, sent Colonel Mark Trevor to attack the convoy. The latter made great havoc among them, and seized the ammunition and supplies. This disaster, which happened within sight of Dundalk, caused such a panic in O'Neill's army, that he hastily withdrew into Longford.† Inchiquin, flushed with his victory, came before Dundalk and summoned it to surrender. Monk's soldiers, who a day or two previously, had promised to stand by him to the last, "ran away over the trenches to Inchiquin, swearing deep oaths that they would not engage with Monk, who entered into confederacy with Owen Rowe, the head of the native Irish."‡ The fear of Inchiquin may have had more to do with this desertion than Owen Roe, for by the latter's arrangement with Monk, he was to fight for the Parliament, whilst Inchiquin, having turned traitor to the Parliamentarians, was now fighting against them. If Monk's soldiers truly stated the cause of their desertion, it is a strong proof of the unreasoning hatred they had for the Celtic Irish.

Monk's soldiers having deserted him, Dundalk was at once surrendered to Inchiquin, "upon no other conditions, but that Monk might dispose of what was his as he saw good."§ Accordingly he sold off whatever he owned, and, says Whitelock, "Colonel Mark Trevor was there a great purchaser, and bought choice sheep for three pound a score, cows for thirty pound a score, and horses for forty pound a score, and so made himself up a regiment, and was made governor of the town to boot."|| He had lately changed sides. Monk proceeded to London, where he was called upon by the Council of State, then the governing body, to account for his having any transactions with O'Neill. Monk appears to have given very good reasons from his own

* Aphor. Discovery, Vol. II., p. 216.

† Colonel Henry O'Neill says, in his Journal, that he went to Clones.

‡ Whitelock's English Affairs, London, 1732, p. 416. Quoted in Preface to 2nd Vol. of Aphorism. Discovery, p. ix.

§ Ibid.

|| Ibid.

standpoint for his having done so, looking especially to the danger he was in from Inchiquin, who was then marching on Dundalk from Drogheda. The Council expressed its disapproval "of what General Monk had done in concluding a peace with the grand and bloody Irish rebel, Owen Rowe O'Neal, did abhor the having anything to do with him therein," but expressed their opinion, that Monk did, according to his judgement, what he believed best for the English interest, and so decided that he was not to be further questioned about the same for the time to come. Monk was much provoked at the whole proceeding, and "some did think it was never forgotten by him."*

As soon as peace had been concluded between Ormonde and the Confederates, their armies were united into one, and from that time Ormonde's great design was to make himself master of Dublin, believing that the taking of the capital would decide the fate of the kingdom. With this view he applied himself actively to increase his forces, and with such success that on the 1st of June, he had assembled at Carlow 6,000 foot and 2,000 horse; and on the 14th of the same month, he was joined by Inchiquin with 2,000 foot. There is no mention of horse, but in those days a proportion of horse was an essential part of any force, so that in all probability Inchiquin had also with him some 400 or 500 horse at least.† Thus reinforced, Ormonde moved towards Dublin, taking Naas in his way, and halted at Castleknock. Besides this army, Castlehaven was at the head of 5,000 foot and 1,000 horse,‡ with which he had taken Maryborough, Athy and other places, during the month of May, and with which he must have joined Ormonde, as we find him at Rathmines with him. Jones at this time also received reinforcements from England, but their numbers are variously stated. Ludlow, who ought to be a good authority on the points, says they consisted of a regiment of horse and two regiments of foot, but regiments were seldom or never up to their full complement.§

After his successful expedition to Drogheda and Dundalk, Inchiquin returned to Finglas with "an unimpaired army;" but he soon had to take his departure for Munster. It was reported, and correctly, that Cromwell intended to land in that Province, which had been denuded of its troops to swell Ormonde's forces

* Ibid., p. 419.

† Carte, Vol. II., pp. 71 and 72.

‡ Carte sets down the forces under Castlehaven at 2,000 foot and 300 horse, but the above numbers are given by Castlehaven himself, *Memoirs*, p. 108.

§ Cox gives the forces brought from England by Colonels Reynolds and Venables to the relief of Jones, as 600 horse and 1,500 foot. Vol. II., p. 6.

in preparation for his intended attack upon Dublin; and so it was thought necessary to despatch Inchiquin into those parts to protect them, and harass and obstruct Cromwell in his progress. He took his departure with two regiments of horse and his own guards, a force which may be roundly set down at 2,000 men, all told. Cromwell after all did not land in Munster, but in Dublin.

Lord Dillon of Castello, having been left at Finglas with 2,000 foot and 500 horse to prevent supplies entering Dublin from the North, Ormonde crossed the Liffey on the 25th of July,* and encamped at Rathmines. He took Rathfarnham, a place about two miles, south of Rathmines, by storm, and after some days resolved to seize an old fort called Baggotrath, which lay between him and the sea. The chief reason for trying to occupy Baggotrath was to prevent Jones's horse from grazing in the fields near it, and so starve them, as they seemed to have no fodder in the city. This attempt led to the battle of Rathmines, so fatal to Ormonde and his army. Before any movement was made on Baggotrath, Lord Castlehaven, General Preston, Major General Purcell, and Sir A. Aston were sent to examine the place, and on their return approved of it in all respects for the object intended. As soon as it was dark on the evening of the 1st of August, Purcell with 1,500 foot (the number settled upon as sufficient), and materials for fortifying, set out for Baggotrath, but did not arrive there till within less than an hour of daylight. Ormonde rode over as soon as there was light, and, to his disappointment found the work but little advanced, while it was also discovered that parties of Jones's troops were drawn out under the city defences, observing those engaged at Baggotrath. The question then was, ought Purcell's party retire, or should they go on with the work of fortifying. It was resolved to proceed with the work, and await Jones, should he attack them. Ormonde, who, according to Carte, had been up all night, returned to his quarters to take some repose, and as he rode through the camp he ordered all the regiments to stand to their arms, and be ready to meet Jones;† at least Carte says so, with what truth we cannot now determine.‡

* Carte, II., p. 77.

† Carte, II., p. 79.

‡ Ibid., p. 81. "Under the circumstances the Lord Lieutenant should either have withdrawn his troops, or brought up his whole army to cover his works. He did neither, but returned to his camp at Rathmines, and lay down to sleep! What are we to say of the general, who went to sleep at the very moment that he saw the enemy preparing to attack his lines?"—Taylor's *Civil Wars in Ireland*, Vol. II., pp. 12-13.

Ormonde had not long gone to rest when he was aroused by volleys of shot, from which it was clear Jones had attacked the party at Baggotrath. He mounted as quickly as he could, rode towards that place, but had scarcely gone a hundred paces, when he met Purcell's men flying towards him, Jones having attacked and routed them. In this attack, Sir W. Vaughan fell mortally wounded. A complete panic seems to have seized the main body, although it cannot be said the attack was unexpected. The men whom Ormonde, some hours before, had told to stand to their arms, did not do so, but fled disgracefully, and so precipitantly, that it was found impossible to rally them. It was a day of unparalleled humiliation for Ormonde, for he found himself routed and ruined by the man to whom he, a short time before, had delivered the King's Castle of Dublin, the accredited representative of the King's enemies in Ireland. No wonder that the Irish, always loyal to the King, believed that Ormonde had a secret understanding with the Parliament. This victory surprised no one more than Jones himself. The very utmost he intended was to drive Purcell's party from Baggotrath, but having routed them so easily, he pursued his success till the great Royal Army, as it was vauntingly called, literally fled like sheep before him.* Baggage, ammunition, arms, everything fell into Jones's hands, including £4,000 which was at Rathfarnham, and which in their headlong flight they forgot to carry away. "Jones," according to the Marquis of Ormonde's account, "slew 600 in that engagement; some upon the spot, and in the pursuit; but the greatest part after they had lain down their arms, upon promise of quarter, and had been for almost an hour prisoners; and divers of them were murdered, after they were brought within the works at Dublin."† Carte gives the prisoners at 300 officers and 1,500 common soldiers. Whatever the killed and wounded and prisoners may have been, one thing is

* For some account of Baggotrath, see Appendix.

† Carte. Original Papers, Vol. II., p. 397. No great number could have been killed in actual combat, for there was very little real fighting; but the number of prisoners seems to be understated. Ludlow says: "Having routed these [Inchiquin's horse] he marched with all diligence up to the walls of Rathmines, which were about 16 feet high. and contained about ten acres of ground, where many of the enemies foot had shut themselves; but perceiving their army to be entirely routed, and their general fled, they yielded themselves prisoners. After this our men continuing their pursuit, found a party of about two thousand foot of the Lord Inchiquin's, in a grove belonging to Rathgar, who after some defence, obtained conditions for their lives, and next day most of them took up arms in our service." *Memoirs*, p. 298. Cox says (Vol. II., p. 7), that 4,000 men were killed, and 2,517 taken prisoners; several officers of note, all the artillery, 200 draught oxen, and all the baggage of an *exceedingly rich camp* became the reward and prize of the victors.

certain, the Royal Army was utterly broken at Rathmines, on that memorable 2nd of August, 1649.

As to the numbers engaged at this battle, there is little or no difficulty about the strength of Jones's forces, but it is not so easy to give a reasonably accurate idea of the number who fought, or rather who ought to have fought, under Ormonde. Carte says Jones's army consisted of 4,000 foot and 1,200 horse, and Ludlow, from the opposite side, gives it as between four and five thousand; so that there is but little discrepancy. Ormonde always maintained he had only 8,000 troops at Rathmines, while Jones held that he had 18,000. The truth may lie between. I will here reckon up Ormonde's forces as stated by his friends, who would be more likely to minimize than exaggerate them. When he reviewed his army at Carlow, on the 1st of June, they numbered, as we have seen, 8,000 horse and foot; on the 14th of the same month, Inchiquin joined him, at the same place, with 2,000 men. The number under Castlehaven, as stated above from his own memoirs, was 6,000 horse and foot, with which he *must have joined Ormonde*, for he was at Rathmines. This makes a total of 16,000 men. Two deductions are to be made from this. Lord Dillon was left at the North of Dublin with 2,000, or as some say 2,500 men; Inchiquin was sent to Munster with a force, which I estimate at from 1,500 to 2,000.* From 4,000 to 4,500 must therefore be deducted from the entire force of 16,000; so that we may fairly conclude that the Royal Army at Rathmines did not fall far short of 12,000 men.

It is hard to explain why Purcell and his party took a whole night to go from Rathmines to Baggotrath, the ground lying between being as level as a bowling-green, as the author can attest from intimate knowledge. The distance between them, Carte says, was but half a mile; so that a whole night was spent in traversing one half mile of level ground! Carte, copying the notorious Peter Walsh, explains it thus:—The treacherous Irish guides employed to conduct Purcell and his party to Baggotrath, influenced by one of their priests, a certain Edmund O'Reilly, led them astray. Nothing but Carte's anxiety to cast odium upon the Irish and their religion, could have betrayed him into the childish folly of adopting the assertion, that they could have been led astray under the circumstances. What did Purcell and his party want with guides at all? They had been a week at Rathmines, in sight of Baggot-

* The English Officer in Sir J. Clottworthy's regiment says he went to Munster with "1,500 horse, foot and dragoons," p. 81.

rath ; Purcell himself ought to have been the best guide, for he had been over inspecting the place with the view of occupying it. The real fact appears to be that Ormonde's camp was too full of good things, and that the soldiers gave themselves up to riotous enjoyment, and neglected their duty. This view is strongly emphasized by Cox, who says, "When the Lord Lieutenant came in the morning to view the fortification, he did not find it in that condition he expected ; *Purcell excusing himself by the fault of his guide : hereupon the care of the affair was committed to another officer.*"*

But the Irish did more than mislead Purcell's party, for Carte says they were the chief cause of the loss of the battle, on account of the inexpertness of the *Irish* officers, the rawness of *their* soldiers, and the panic which seized the *Irish* horse, who quitted the field upon Sir W. Vaughan being killed in the first charge, and could never be brought to rally.† Cox writes in the same strain ; so that we are asked to believe that Irish treachery and Irish cowardice lost the battle of Rathmines to Ormonde. The time is long past, if it ever existed, when one would feel it necessary to offer even a word in vindication of Irish valour. It has been proved on too many hard fought, unforgotten fields. I myself have had the great privilege of knowing the grand old soldier who was the first man who scaled the defences, and entered Badajoz on the "murderous night" of the 6th of April, 1812 ; and he told me, as he climbed the scaling ladder that he saw the bayonets of the enemy in glittering files on the works above him ready to receive him on their points : yet he got in. Nor was he a braggard, that brave old Sergeant Mitchall, but a man of few words, modest as he was fearless. He was an Irishman and a Catholic, and had the unprecedented honour of wearing thirteen clasps above his Peninsular medal. And doubtless Lord Wolesley does not yet forget that his own countrymen were the first in the enemy's works, on the famous night of Tel-el-Kebir.

But Carte and Cox belonged to a class of men, unfortunately a large one, who, after the fashion of the Jews of old, felt bound to assert, and continued to assert or insinuate, that nothing good could come from Ireland.‡ Such has been the work for centuries ; and they are labouring at it still. There can be no worse enemies to the connexion of the two nations than they ; for by flinging their insolent falsehoods and haughty contempt

* Cox, Vol. II., p. 6. The italics are mine.

† Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 81.

‡ "Can anything of good come from Nazareth ?

at a proud and sensitive race, they have done more to engender and perpetuate hatred to England, than the wholesale robberies of James or the savage butcheries of Cromwell.

Neither Cox nor Carte was cotemporaneous with the events which followed the Rising of 1641. Carte was a laborious and valuable collector, but his affectionate devotion to his hero was such that he modified or explained away whatever might have the effect of dimming the portrait of him which he had determined to transmit to posterity. Cox was the son of an adventurer, who in a short time amassed a large fortune out of the Irish confiscations under James I., most of which was lost by the war of 1641; so that he had a special reason for being prejudiced and unjust towards the Irish, as he was to a most indefensible extent. Neither Cox nor Carte belonged to the military profession. Let us, then, hear a man on the battle of Rathmines who was a soldier, a contemporary and an Englishman. Thus writes the English officer in Sir John Clottworthy's regiment:—"The besieged, about eight of the clock in the morning sallied out all at one gate, and fell on the next guard, and beat them, and so the next, and to the next without any smart opposition, till they met one Sir William Vaughan, a colonel of horse, and one MacThomas Fitzgerald, a colonel of horse, with what men they got together, who fought them courageously; and then those who came out being better seconded than those who opposed them, the besiegers were at last beaten and put to route. After which there was no more fighting worthy relating, but all took the run, of which many got into the house where they made their quarters, both soldiers and officers. Most of the army escaped or got quarters, and were not long followed, for the plunder of merchants' shops, sutlers' tents, and many other inducing matters abated much the fury of the execution. For, such a camp for plenty of all things, and rich withal, was never seen in Ireland before, so as it might well be baits to poor soldiers close besieged. This army was called the Army Royal, and well it might be so, and for riches and number may well be paralleled to King Darius's army, when he fought against Alexander the Great; who being so numerous and confident, undervaluing their enemies, that the most of them never thought that fighting would come to their turn, and so were gaping on till they were routed without fighting—I mean the most part of the army. Of all conduct none is more worse than to lose an army without drawing them to fight and to second one another. Some old soldiers, especially MacArt [Owen Roe O'Neill], as I was told, was of opinion that that army would be beaten. His reason was, that there was

not forts or medaloons made against the gates to hinder sudden incursions out of the city ; so that all the whole within might come out at one gate, and so fall on some quarter of the camp of the besiegers, and likely might be as many in number, if not more, as that quarter they fell on—so as works before the gates would be security, at least some stop, till that quarter of the camp charged had gotten a supply and relief from other quarters.”*

When Ormonde was defeated at Rathmines, he, with an escort of horse, hurried to his stronghold in Kilkenny. He took his route by Ballysonan, a castle near Kilcullen in the Co. Kildare, which was then held against him by the enemy. Coming before it he called upon the garrison to surrender, saying that he was after winning the battle of Rathmines, and that they would refuse at their peril. Believing that he spoke the truth, they placed the Castle in his hands, which he at once garrisoned with a number of his own men then with him, and proceeded on his journey. Thus did the proud head of the house of Butler get possession of Ballysonan by a mean barefaced lie.

We must now return to O'Neill, to record briefly the closing events of his life. In the beginning of May, 1649, he found himself encompassed on all sides with difficulties, and no longer in a position to serve his country ; the most he could do was to defend himself against his many and powerful enemies. The junction of the Confederate forces with Ormonde's left Owen no choice but to come to some arrangement with one or other of the Parliament Generals. Coote was closely besieged in Derry by the Lord of Ardes and Sir R. Stewart, and in his difficulties sent to O'Neill, and offered him certain terms if he would go to his relief. Owen “ had no ambition, nor means left to get away, unless by taking some desperate course ; on which he settled his thoughts, and off-hand summoned a provincial council to meet at Belturbet, where it was concluded (upon the invitation sent by Sir Charles Coote) to treat with him for ammunition ; and commissioners [were] appointed immediately to meet him for that purpose, or his Commissioners, at Newtown, near Drimahire, where Colonel Richard Coote and Major Ormsby met, and agreed to give thirty barrels of powder, ball and match proportionably, and three hundred beeves, or four hundred pounds in money conditionally : O'Neill should march with his army to relieve Derry ; Secretary Glancy was left at Sligo to receive the ammunition ; but within two days after, Colonel Coote

* The History of the Wars of Ireland from 1641 to 1653. By a British officer of the Regiment of Sir John Clottworthy, pp. 81 et seq.

wrote to O'Neill that his brother the Lord President would not stand to these articles, and so broke off. Whereupon to try other conclusions, Hugh McPat. Duff McMahon was sent to Colonel Monk with the like proposal which was readily granted.* The unfortunate result of the agreement with Monk is given above. When O'Neill had retired to Clones from the neighbourhood of Dundalk, after losing his ammunition, "an express came to him the next day from Sir Charles Coote, acquainting him that Derry was again besieged by my Lord Montgomery and the Scotch, and that he would allow and ratify the former proposals, so he went to raise the Scotch from Derry, which O'Neill was forced to accept of this time; and in order to make good his part of the agreement, marches by short steps with his army, consisting of 2,000 men, till he came to Ballykelly in the county of Derry, of which he possessed himself. The Scotch hearing of his approach, raised their siege and posted away by day and night, till they were over the Bann water, in their own country."† From this nimble activity of theirs, we may infer that they retained a lively recollection of their defeat at Benburb.

After the departure of the Scotch, O'Neill led his army up to Derry, and encamped before it on the Tyrone side of the river, where president Coote came to compliment him, and perform his conditions. He afterwards invited him and his chief officers into the town, and entertained them most hospitably. Whilst O'Neill remained encamped before Derry, which was for about eight or nine days, he fell ill of his death sickness. There has been always a very general and firm tradition in Ireland that he was made away with by slow poison, whilst at Derry. Two principal accounts are given of the way in which he was poisoned. The first is that of the author of the *Aphorismical Discovery*, who seems to have been of his suite. That author says that amongst "the extraordinarie plentie and curiositie" with which O'Neill was feted, it was "surely bruited" that a cup of slow poison was given to him, through the effects of which, his hair and nails fell off by degrees. His physician, Doctor Owen O'Sheel was absent at the time, and those who were available, treated him for gout. The second version of the poisoning is that of Colonel Henry O'Neill, who says:—"O'Neill continued encamped [before Derry] eight or nine days longer, where he unfortunately fell sick, occasioned (as some confidently affirmed, and was myself since assured by an English officer that it was so), by a poisoned pair of russet leather boots, sent him as a present by a gentleman

* Colonel H. O'Neill's Journal in *Desiderata Curiosa Hibernica*, p. 519.

† *Ibid.*, p. 520.

of the Plunkets, from the county of Louth, who boasted to this gentleman, that he did the English a considerable service in dispatching O'Neill out of the world."* If O'Neill were poisoned, as is not at all unlikely, suspicion would naturally attach to Coote, the members of whose family, throughout the whole war, were the most implacable enemies of the Irish; nor would the relief of Derry which was only a passing arrangement, change this feeling. Besides 'tis likely that Coote had heard that O'Neill was about to join Ormonde. The Plunkets were Palesmen and Ormondites, but they were also Catholics, and certainly not noted for wicked deeds, and it is very hard to see what object a Plunket would have had in poisoning the Catholic General. Owen's last public act was to forgive the Confederates for their persecution of him, and to come to terms with Ormonde, but this was too late to be of any practical service against Cromwell. Growing worse and worse he was removed to Clogh-otter water, near Cavan, where he died surrounded with all the consolations of religion, on the 6th of November, 1649. He was interred in the old Abbey of Cavan.†

Many words are not necessary here about Owen Roe O'Neill. His name and his deeds still live fresh and green as ever on Irish soil. No general appeared in the war of 1641 that could bear comparison with him. Both friends and enemies knew this, and hence the men he led felt he could lead them to victory, whilst his enemies, dreading his generalship, never met him in the field when they could avoid it. His name was worth a thousand men and more in any battle, and the enemy fled before it, perhaps even more than they did before his soldiers. He marched to the relief of Derry with a small, ill-provided army, but when the Scotch besiegers heard he was coming, they raised the siege, and fled for their lives night and day until they found security beyond the Bann. He had all the qualities of a great general. He never fought at a disadvantage, and took the greatest care of the lives of his troops. He gave incessant attention to discipline and training; from experience as well as natural ability he was a thorough strategist, but above all and before all he was of the most untiring vigilance. He never rested satisfied, until he saw with his own eyes that everything was done which he had ordered to be done. He left nothing to chance. Had he been seconded as he should have been, he would have achieved the civil rights and religious freedom of his country, in spite of any power that could have been arrayed against him; but those who were associated with him, and

* O'Neill's Journal in *Desiderata Curiosa Hibernica*, pp. 519-20.

† *Ibid.*, 521.

who should have been his friends, thwarted every design of his, and never rested until they had proclaimed a traitor and an outlaw, the only man amongst them who remained true to his country, true to his religion, and true to that Oath of Association, which all of them had so solemnly taken. But when Cromwell and Ireton with their Puritans swept over the land like a terrible hurricane, many of the unprincipled traffickers in the blood of their countrymen, who had deserted O'Neill, met with their deserts. To the last the Catholic General stood by the Nuncio, because he believed he represented the authority of the Church of Ireland, to fight for whose liberties he himself had returned from Spain to his native land. Although he was unable to accomplish all he intended for the good of his country, it is beyond doubt, that the most successful conqueror or patriot of ancient or modern times, never held a higher place in the hearts of those he served, than the great Owen Roe O'Neill does in the hearts of his grateful and admiring countrymen.

CHAPTER XVII.

BEFORE we enter upon Cromwell's campaign in Ireland, it is well to try and realise to ourselves what manner of man he was. But this is no easy task. Like almost every man who has played a conspicuous and important part on the stage of life, he had a host of enemies, with some friends and admirers, and their varied and clashing opinions about him continue to be put forward down to the present hour. His enemies have made him a dark designing hypocrite, who did everything with an ulterior and selfish object, whilst his admirers paint him as a man whose qualities rose almost to the heroic. He certainly had great talents, but of a peculiar kind; he believed in himself; he had the power of keeping his own counsel, giving to others only as much of it as suited his designs. How far he believed in his personal inspiration it is hard to say, but he spoke and acted like a man who wished to suggest the idea, that he and Divine Providence understood each other very well, and that he was a chosen instrument in the hands of that Providence. "Thorough" was a favourite word with Strafford, but Cromwell was still more thorough than Black Tom himself. It is said of him that he was of loose morals in his youth, and this charge is so feebly denied by his apologists, that the denial is a kind of admission of its truth. Even so, many men whose early lives would not bear strict scrutiny, have become eminent for virtue and sanctity; and if Oliver was not all he ought to have been in his youth, he more than made up for his shortcomings, by prayer and preaching, after his conversion. Both these exercises seemed to give him much pleasure, and he professed his confidence in those who employed themselves in the same way. Writing to a friend after the battle of Dunbar, he says:—"I was not satisfied with your last speech to me about Empson, 'that he was a better preacher than fighter or soldier,' or words to that effect. Truly I think he that prays and preaches best will fight best."*

It is a popular notion that Cromwell was no more than a Huntingdon farmer who left the plough at forty, took to soldiering and politics, and finally became Lord Protector—nay, King of England in everything but the name. This idea of

* Cornish's *Life of Cromwell*, London, 1882, p. 257.

Cromwell's social position is very incorrect. The man who rose to be Lord Protector, belonged to an important county family, and his father Robert Cromwell, a gentleman of moderate means, was the third son of Sir Oliver Cromwell, of Hinchinbrook House.* The original name of the Cromwells of Huntingdon was Williams. They had migrated from Glamorganshire, and Richard Williams, the great-grandfather of our Oliver, was a near kinsman of Thomas Cromwell, who became Earl of Essex. This Richard Williams assumed the family name of Cromwell, out of gratitude, it may be supposed, to his relative, Thomas—"the mauler of monks"—who had enriched him with the spoils of the monasteries; so that it was most natural for the famous Oliver to be a hater of Popery. He went to school in Huntingdon, and although he sometimes applied himself to his lessons, he was, on the whole, looked upon as an idler. He entered at Cambridge in 1616, where he remained less than a year and a half, leaving without having taken a degree. In short, he was not an educated man, in the common acceptance of the word. He was cousin to the famous John Hampden, and when he resided at St. Ives, it is recorded of him that he paid his quota of ship-money, which his cousin Hampden refused to do.

Ship-money was an odious tax, and was regarded as unconstitutional. However, the majority of the judges in Westminster Hall were persuaded to declare it as law, "That for the supply of shipping to defend the nation, the King might impose a tax upon the people; that he was to be judge of the necessity of such supply, and of the quantity to be imposed for it; and that he might imprison as well as distrain in case of refusal."†

The time at which Oliver got the call to a new life is not precisely fixed; writing to his cousin Mrs. St. John in October, 1638, he says:—"You know what my manner of life hath been. Oh, I lived and loved darkness, and hated light; I was a chief, the chief of sinners. This is true; I hated godliness, yet God had mercy on me. O the riches of his mercy! Praise him for me;—pray for me, that He who hath begun a good work would perfect it in the day of Christ."‡

Some years after his marriage, which took place in August,

* Carlyle says Robert's father was Sir Henry, not Sir Oliver Cromwell, but Cornish gives the names as above.

† *Letters and Speeches by Carlyle*, Vol. I., p. 80. Sir John Finch, Lord Chief-Justice of the King's Bench, was the contriver of this tax, and canvassed the rest of the judges in its favour, for which he was made Lord Keeper of the Great Seal. He was afterwards impeached of high-treason, but escaped to Holland.

‡ *Ludlow's Memoirs*, Vol. I., p. 6.

1620, Cromwell got an accession to his property by the death of a relative, which raised his income to £400 or £500 a year, a sum equal, at least, to £1,500 at the present time. He led a quiet private life till he was over 40 years of age; he then became in some sense a public man in connection with the drainage of the Fens. The Court, always in straits for money, sold the right to the profits of this drainage to courtiers, and so turned it into a monopoly. The people rose against the injustice, and Cromwell became their leader. This made him popular, and, perhaps, had something to do with his return to Parliament in 1640, for the town of Cambridge. At this period he is thus graphically described:—"The first time that I ever took notice of him," writes Sir Philip Warwick, "was in the very beginning of the Parliament held in November, 1640, when I vainly thought myself a courtly young gentleman; for we courtiers valued ourselves much upon our good clothes. I came one morning into the House well clad, and perceived a gentleman speaking, whom I knew not, very ordinarily apparelled; for it was a plain cloth suit, which seemed to have been made by an ill country tailor. His linen was plain, and not very clean; and I remember a speck or two of blood upon his little band, which was not much larger than his collar. His hat was without hat-band; his stature was of a good size; his sword stuck close to his side; his countenance swollen and reddish; his voice sharp and untunable; and his eloquence full of fervour."*

Cromwell became a politician in the Fens' agitation, and probably to a greater extent than he himself had realized. When he entered the House of Commons he took his seat with the Independents. The man who became a Dictator in later life, turned away from the Presbyterians, because they insisted on obedience to their decrees with all the authority of a General Council, whilst the Independents held, in theory at least, that "every Christian Church or Congregation is entitled to elect its

* Life of Cromwell by Cornish, p. 29. Referring to this description Carlyle says:—"The 'band,' we may remind our readers, is a linen tippet, properly the shirt collar of those days, which, when the hair was worn long needed to fold itself with a good expanse of washable linen over the upper works of the coat, and defend these and their velvets from harm. The 'specks of blood,' if not fabulous, we, not without general sympathy, attribute to bad razors. As for the 'hat-band,' one remarks that men did not speak with their hats on; and therefore will, with Sir Philip's leave, omit that; the 'untunable voice,' or what a poor young gentleman in these circumstances would consider as such, is very significant to us." *Letters and Speeches*, Vol. I., p. 88. It is surprising that Mr. Carlyle thought he settled the hat-band question, by saying that members "did not speak with their hats on." Surely Oliver's hat was placed near him where it could be seen. At any rate he covered as soon as he sat down, as the custom was, when his hat would become visible to all.

own officers, to manage all its own affairs, and to stand independent of, and irresponsible to all authority saving that only of the Supreme and Divine Head of the Church, the Lord Jesus Christ." The Presbyterians were more numerous in the House of Commons than the Independents, and Cromwell soon perceived that some other power besides that of his party was necessary to him ; that power was the army and the army alone. So he set himself at once to get the army into his hands, and succeeded to a marvel. "That adventurer had equally obtained the confidence of the commander-in-chief and of the common soldier. Dark, artful, and designing, he governed Fairfax by his suggestions, while he pretended only to second the projects of that general. Among the privates he appeared as the advocate of liberty and toleration, joined with them in their conventicles, equalled them in the cant of fanaticism, and affected to resent their wrongs as religionists and their privations as soldiers. To his fellow-officers he lamented the ingratitude and jealousy of the Parliament, a court in which experience showed that no man, not even the most meritorious patriot was secure. To-day he might be in high favour, to-morrow at the insidious suggestion of some obscure lawyer or narrow-minded bigot, he might find himself under arrest, and be consigned to the Tower. That Cromwell already aspired to the eminence to which he afterwards soared, is hardly credible ; but that his ambition was awakened, and that he laboured to bring the army into collision with the Parliament, was evident to the most careless observer."* That he was prime mover in Colonel Pride's purging of the Parliament in December, 1648, there is no doubt, but he took care to be absent from London at the time, thus seeming to take no part in it.

Cromwell had a great knack of putting blame and responsibility away from himself. It was Providence did it, God would have it so, or, it was the villainy or wrong-headedness of men, that compelled him to do things he had no mind to ! Early in the troubles he writes of the King :—"The Lord hath hardened his heart more and more ; he has refused to hear reason, or to care for our cause or religion or peace." Oliver was always in the right, and those who acted with him were "honest men." He said to Lord Manchester soon after the war had begun, tentatively,

* Lingard's England, Vol. VIII., p. 77. Dr. Lingard adds in a note :—"As early as August 2nd, 1648, Huntingdon, the major of his regiment, in his account of Cromwell's conduct, noticed, that in his chamber at Kingston, he said, 'What a sway Stapleton and Hollis had heretofore in the kingdom, and he knew nothing to the contrary, but that he was as well able to govern the kingdom, as either of them.'"—*Journals X.*, 411.

no doubt : " If you will stick to *honest men* you shall have such an army as shall give the law to King and Parliament too."* He could write and speak in the mildest and simplest manner—" I told him so, *indeed I did*," " I thought so, *indeed I did*;" in these and like forms he put forward his views, with the apparent timidity of a school girl. But the evil qualities of his nature were but thinly lacquered over by such phraseology. The part he took in the King's condemnation and death was of the most decided character. He said to Algernon Sydney, " I tell you, we will cut off his head with the crown upon it!" " He is said to have threatened Colonel Downs into acquiescence with the other regicides, to have held Colonel Ingoldsby's hand whilst he signed, and to have smeared Henry Martin's face with ink as soon as he had signed his own name. It is generally asserted also that he desired to view the King's body as it lay in the coffin, which he tried to open with his staff. But failing to do so, he took a sword from a soldier, and forced the lid open with the hilt of it. He then stood and gazed at it steadily, saying that 'it appeared sound and well made for a long life;' or according to another account, 'that if he had not been a King, he might have lived longer.' The credit of Charles's death, for good or evil, is generally given to Cromwell. He was actively consenting to it, and without his consent and co-operation, it would not have been carried out."† During his career up to the King's death, Cromwell's favourite themes were patriotism and liberty—" liberty for this poor country of ours." But immediately after the King was disposed of, and that Cromwell became the first man in the realm, he changed his note, and his mild and friendly biographer is compelled to write of him, that he, in order to deal with all interests, had " to meet plot with counterplot, and make use of all the methods of secret information; *to check freedom of speech and action*, and by turns deceive and coerce. The word NECESSITY—" the tyrant's plea"—was henceforward constantly on his lips, and like other liberators, he was drawn on by a fatal necessity *to imitate the very principles and methods of the tyranny which he had overthrown*."‡

But it was in the dismissal of the Long Parliament that Cromwell's character came out with sharpest distinctness. " It seems clear that he had, by this time, conceived the idea of making himself King; but great difficulties stood in the way,

* Cornish's Life of Cromwell, p. 86. The Italics in the above passages are mine. J. O'R.

† Cornish's Life of Cromwell, p. 179.

‡ Cornish, p. 187.

for there was a large and influential party of sincere republicans, who wanted no King. The leader of this party was Sir Henry Vane, the most important man in the House of Commons except Cromwell. He wished to diminish the number of the army, both for the sake of retrenchment and the public safety. He wished a new representative Chamber [or body] to be chosen more fairly and reasonably than former Parliaments; and until this was accomplished, he thought the existing Parliament should not surrender its powers. Every point in this view of Vane's interfered with and crossed Cromwell's plans. He found as many faults as he could with Vane's bill, but Vane had made up his mind to pass his bill. So Cromwell's counter move was to make a clean sweep of the Long Parliament before the bill could be passed, which Vane was rapidly hurrying through its stages. Cromwell was at Whitehall on the 19th of April, 1653, holding a conference with some of his officers for establishing a Council of Notables, with himself at their head, until a permanent form of government could be established. They broke up without coming to any definite conclusion. They met again early on the morning of the 20th, but were not long in conclave when intelligence reached them, that the Parliament intended to pass Sir H. Vane's bill into law that morning. Cromwell rose from his seat, and went at once down to the House accompanied by a file of musketeers. These he left in the lobby, and entered the House himself, dressed in a plain suit of black, with gray worsted stockings. He sat on a back bench and listened with seeming interest to the debate, but when the Speaker was going to put the question, he whispered to Harrison, 'This is the time, I must do it.' He rose, uncovered, and addressed the House; at first mildly and decorously, but by degrees becoming violent, he attacked the members, charging them with profaneness and tyranny. Some he named or pointed out, and called them the most opprobrious and shameful names. He told them the Lord had disowned them—that He had done with them, and had chosen other instruments. At length a member, Sir Peter Wentworth, interrupting, said he had never listened to language so unparliamentary, or at all so offensive, since it was addressed to them by their own servant, whom they had too fondly cherished, and whom, by their unprecedented bounty, they had made what he was. At these words Cromwell put on his hat, and springing from his place, exclaimed, 'Come, come, sir, I will put an end to your prating.' He paced up and down for a few seconds in apparently the most violent agitation, and then stamping on the floor added, 'You are no parliament. I say you are no parliament: bring

them in, bring them in.' The door was at once thrown open, and Colonel Worseley entered, followed by more than twenty musketeers. 'This,' cried Sir Henry Vane, 'is not honest. It is against morality and common honesty.' Then Cromwell fell a railing at him, crying out with a loud voice, 'O Sir Henry Vane, Sir Henry Vane! the Lord deliver me from Sir Henry Vane.' He pointed to the Speaker, Lenthall, saying, 'fetch him down;' then pointing to the mace he said, 'What shall we do with this fools' bauble? Here, take it away!' After this smart piece of work, Oliver grew pious, and turning to the members of the House, he cried, 'It is you that have forced me to this. *I have sought the Lord night and day*, that he would rather slay me than put me upon the doing of this work.' He then ordered the guard to clear the House, took up the act and put it under his cloak, commanded the doors to be locked up, and went away to Whitehall."*

Sir Philip Warwick's portraiture of Cromwell has been already placed before the reader; another by one of his latest biographers is worth being re-produced here. It describes him as he probably appeared about the time of the taking of Basing House, the princely stronghold and residence of the Marquis of Winchester. This occurred in October, 1645. "He was now," says Mr. Cornish, "in the vigour of his manhood, unbroken by illness, unsoured by opposition; his faith was not clouded with difficulties; he had committed no crime against loyalty or liberty. Let us draw a protrait of him as he was seen by the eyes of friends and enemies then. In height he was under six feet, big and strongly made, good at manly exercise, a bold rider and a lover of horses, his shoulders broad, his head (set a little aside) large, 'a vast treasury of natural parts;' with sweetness as well as dignity in the open brow and the fall of the thin greyish hair. His eyebrows were thick, with deep-cut wrinkles between them, and a large wart over the right eye. Light grey eyes, looking out inscrutably as if they said, 'I will know thy thoughts, but thou shalt not know mine;' eyes that could express tenderness, severity, burning zeal, religious exaltation, flaming human anger. The expression of the mouth and chin is variously given by the portraits; but secrecy, strength of will and impatience of control are never absent. His complexion was a source of endless satisfaction to his enemies. 'Ruby nose,' 'Copper nose,' and after a while 'Nose Almighty' are the common nicknames given him. His face is described as tanned leather. We must

* Ludlow's Memoirs, pp. 455, et seq. See Cornish, pp. 294-5. Lingard, Vol. VIII., pp. 191-2.

imagine a coarse red complexion of scorbutic tendency, and a big red nose ; a countenance not without its own comeliness, not to be looked on with indifference, as of one fit ' to threaten and command.' Such to look upon was Oliver Cromwell when, having put an end to the civil war, he stood forth as the foremost man in England, ' our chief of men.' **

But it is easier to pull down than to build up, and hence Cromwell's real troubles were still nearly all before him.

Fits of religious enthusiasm now and then seize upon the masses, and this was notably the case in Cromwell's generation. Preaching and praying by personal inspiration were the privileges of the saints in those times. The fifth-monarchy men were daily expecting the visible appearance of Christ amongst them, to inaugurate the millennium ; and a chief reason of theirs for seeking to dethrone the King was that the throne might be vacant for the True and only King when He would come. Cromwell was seized to a considerable extent with the prevailing mania, and soon became as prominent and nearly as long-winded a preacher as the best of them.† In this he may have been sincere enough at first, but as he rose to power and importance, and when vistas of future greatness began to open before him, he made his religious enthusiasm subservient to his ambitious designs, and what first passed for pious fervour and religious enthusiasm, began to be called hypocrisy by his enemies. Even Burnet, who is not inclined to be severe on Cromwell says:—"The enthusiast and the dissembler mixed so equally in a great part of his deportment, that it was not easy to tell which was the prevailing character."‡ Whilst this observation is substantially correct, it must be further said that the percentage of the baser ingredient perceptibly increased with time. He tried to become all things to all men who he thought could help him to advance those ambitious designs, which, day after day, seemed to take greater possession of him. But although he laboured to gain popularity, he had a strong conviction of its instability. When he, in company with Lambert and other officers, was going after the army to Scotland in 1650, the people shouted and wished them success as they went along ; whereupon Lambert remarked to Cromwell, that he was glad to see they had the nation on their side. Cromwell answered, "Do not trust to that, for these very

* Cornish's Life of Oliver Cromwell, pp. 115-16.

† Of course he could not match Henderson, who frequently preached for six hours together. Burnet says that this system of interminable preaching and praying rose to such a height, that the ministers sometimes said a grace before meals of an hour's length !

‡ Burnet's History of his own Time, Vol. I., p. 112.

persons would shout as much if you and I were going to be hanged.”*

He always did his best to conceal his real views, whilst he was continually on the watch to read the thoughts of others. “In courage and conduct he equalled the most renowned of his contemporaries ; but he excelled them all in fraud and dissimulation. By these qualities he gained the ascendancy over Fairfax, while he was no more than the second officer in the army.”†

At the battle of Naseby “both Fairfax and Cromwell bore themselves gallantly. Fairfax fought all day without a helmet, careless of his life, riding amongst the shot to every part of the field.” But Cromwell was not to be outdone, for having “had his morion cut from his head by a cavalier with whom he exchanged a bullet singly ; one of his party picked up the helmet and threw it into his saddle, which Oliver, hastily catching, clapped it the wrong way on his head, and so fought with it the rest of the day.”‡ Among his many gifts, Cromwell had that of tears to a copious extent. Burnet says, that Sir Harbotle Grennon, a few weeks before his death, related to him the following incident :—“When the House of Commons and the army were a-quarrelling, at a meeting of the officers it was proposed to purge the army better, that they might know whom to depend on. Cromwell upon that, said he was sure of the army, but there was another body that had more need of purging, naming the House of Commons, and he thought the army only could do that. Two officers that were present brought an account of this to Grimston, who carried them with him to the lobby of the House of Commons, they being resolved to justify it to the House. There was another debate then on foot ; but Grimston diverted it, and said he had a matter of privilege of the highest sort to lay before them ; it was about the being and freedom of the House. So he charged Cromwell with the design of putting a force upon the House : he had his witnesses at the door, and desired they might be examined. They were brought to the bar, and justified all that they had said to him, and gave a full relation of all that had passed at their meetings. When they withdrew, Cromwell fell down on his knees, and made a solemn prayer to God, attesting his innocence, and his zeal for the service of the House. He submitted himself to the Providence of God, who, it seems, thought fit to exercise him with

* *Ibid.*, p. 120.

† *Smollet*, Vol. VII., p. 417. London, 1759.

‡ *Cornish*, p. 105.

calumny and slander; but he committed his cause to Him. This he did with great vehemence, and with many tears.* After this strange and bold preamble, he made so long a speech, justifying both himself and the rest of the officers, except a few that seemed inclined to return back to Egypt, that he wearied out the House, and wrought so much on his party, that what the witnesses had said was so little believed, that had it been moved, Grimston thought, that both he and they would have been sent to the Tower. . . . To complete the scene, as soon as ever Cromwell got out of the House, he resolved to trust himself no more among them: but went to the army, and in a few days he brought them up and forced a great many from the House." "I had much discourse on this head with one who knew Cromwell, and all that set of men; and asked him how they could excuse all the prevarications and other ill things of which they were visibly guilty in the conduct of their affairs. He told me, they believed there were great occasions in which some men were called to great services; in the doing of which they were excused from the common rules of morality; such were the practices of Ehud and Jael, Samson and David; and by this they fancied they had a privilege from observing the standing rules." "It is very obvious," Burnet adds, "how far this principle may be carried and how all justice and mercy may be laid aside on this pretence by every bold enthusiast."†

In explanation of the passage quoted above from Burnet about Cromwell bringing the army to London, it may be useful to say, that the question in debate at the time in the House of Commons was one with regard to coming to terms with the King, then at Hurst Castle. It was debated three days, and at one time there were 340 members present. On the 6th of December Colonel Pride was sent with a strong detachment to Westminster; he discharged the usual guards of both Houses and in their place posted his own soldiers. He took his stand on the lobby with a list of the members in his hand, Lord Grey standing beside him to point out their persons. He arrested 52 of the most distinguished Presbyterian members, and sent them to prison; a further expurgation took place next day, and finally, forty-seven members were imprisoned, and ninety-six excluded, so that the House was reduced to about fifty members, who were dignified with the well known appellation of the "Rump."

* The author of "Killing no Murder," says, his Highness had a faculty to be fluent in his tears and eloquent in his execrations, and that he had spongy eyes, and a supple conscience.

† Burnet's History of his Own Time, Vol. I, pp. 60, 1, 2.

This is known in history as Pride's Purge. It was, doubtless, the work of the man who had solemnly attested on his knees a short time before, his zeal for the service of the House and his innocence; but the "artful Oliver did not arrive in London till the day after Col. Pride had purified the House of Commons, having travelled through the northern counties from Scotland by very slow marches. On his arrival he was conducted to the royal apartment at Whitehall, where it is the common opinion that he occupied one of the King's rich beds. He declared he had not been acquainted with the design of purging the House, yet since it was done he was glad of it, and would endeavour to maintain it."* The army now became the sole governing body in England.

The principles of Cromwell and his party are given above in a general way from Burnet, but they have been more precisely stated by Major Huntingdon who belonged to Cromwell's own regiment. During Cromwell's absence in the North, in 1648, that officer resigned his commission and "published a paper of reasons for doing so, in which, after charging Cromwell with dishonesty, treason, and ambitious designs, he declares that all the evil proceeds from the influence of evil principles, declaring that Cromwell had often professed wrong rules of morality as a standard of what was lawful. They are as follow:—1. That every single man is judge of just and right, as to the good and ill of the kingdom. 2. That the interest of honest men is the interest of the kingdom. 3. That it is lawful to pass through any forms of government for the accomplishing of his end; and therefore, *either to purge the Houses and support the remaining party by force everlastingly, or to put a period to them by force is very lawful, and suitable to the interest of honest men.* 4. That it is lawful to play the knave with a knave." This was published before the purging of the House of Commons, "and would," Mr. Cornish adds, "be worthless if it had been written five years later; but it is remarkable as showing what was, even then, believed of Cromwell's principles and methods of conduct."†

Passing over the king's death and Cromwell's Irish campaign, which will be treated later on, I proceed to give two or three additional illustrations of Oliver's character. He once said, "No man climbs so high as he who does not know where he is climbing to;" and he certainly always kept climbing, and thrusting those above him out of his way. Lord Manchester, Essex,

* Cornish, p. 176.

† Cornish's Life of Cromwell, pp. 173-4. The italics are Mr. Cornish's.

even Fairfax himself, had to submit to be shouldered aside when their turn came. As Oliver ascended the atmosphere cleared, revealing at last the throne of England within measurable distance of him, and to that coveted object he directed all his after climbing. But there came a check : many of the leading men who had stood by him throughout and whose support he struggled hard to retain, had remained faithful to the Commonwealth, and were therefore not to be easily induced to aid him in overturning it. The saints themselves, with whom he fraternized on the most familiar and equal terms, were not to be won over to his ambitious projects. They had gone out, they said, in the simplicity of their hearts to fight the Lord's battles ; they had appealed to Him and He heard them ; they had pulled down monarchy with the king, and could they now build up what they had destroyed ? They had vowed to be true to the Commonwealth without king or kingship, and must they now, after having fought and prevailed, *go back to Egypt* ?*

London was against raising Oliver to the coveted throne, as were many of his best friends and connections. Matters, however, being sufficiently advanced, Colonel Wm. Jephson, one of the members who served for Ireland, moved in the House that Cromwell should be made King. This was meant to sound the feelings of members, and was by no means well received. When Cromwell heard of the proposal (for he had ceased to attend the House, having become too great for that ; but when he heard it from one of his creatures), he took an opportunity of gently reproving the Colonel for what he had done, saying to him, "Get thee gone for a mad fellow as thou art ;" but he soon after gave very substantial promotion to the Colonel, in the shape of a troop of horse for himself, and a foot company for his son, who was then only a scholar in Oxford.†

The form of Procedure called "the Instrument of Government," which had been drawn up by Cromwell himself, was now thrown aside. It had grown too antiquated for his advanced views ; and a form called "the humble Petition and Advice," was substituted for it, which was so constructed as to suggest the

* Burnet's Hist. of his Own Time, Vol. I., p. 96.

Among the saints, Oliver acted like one of themselves, and forbade them to uncover in his presence. Whitelock, speaking of meetings with himself and others, whilst the question of accepting or refusing the crown was undecided, says, "In these meetings, laying aside his greatness, he would be exceedingly familiar with us, and by way of diversion, would make verses with us, and everyone must try his fancy. He commonly called for tobacco, pipes, and a candle, and would now and then take tobacco himself. Then he would fall again to his serious and great business." (See note in Lingard, Vol. VIII., p. 250.)

† Ludlow's Memoirs, p. 583.

raising of him to the throne. By it there were to be two Houses of Parliament, the House of Commons and *the other House*. What was called the *other House* was to represent the House of Lords in reality, but not in *name* for the present, and was to consist of seventy members, all to be named by Cromwell himself. These two Houses were to have legislative authority under a *single person*. The word KING was at first inserted in this form, but was withdrawn, probably by Cromwell's own desire, and a blank was left for the title the single person was to bear. Oliver felt he must be the *single person*, and his hope and ardent desire was that the blank would be filled up with the word KING. Meantime Sir Christopher Pack, an Alderman of London who had received knighthood from Cromwell, proposed in the House that an address be presented to the Protector, desiring him to assume the title and office of King of England. This proposal was met with a fierce outburst of opposition at first, but the House calmed down after a little, and a motion was carried by a large majority to *address* the Protector. Accordingly an address was drawn up, in which he was invited to assume the government of the three kingdoms with the style and title of King of England, according to the laws of the country. The "Humble Petition and Address," so drawn, was presented to the Protector, to be accepted or rejected by him without amendment, as was the constitutional course with a Parliamentary Bill. "Cromwell's conduct, always hard to be spelled, was, in this matter, more dark and intricate than usual."* He took time to consider. He held many private conferences with his friends, but the result was not encouraging.

Not only did Lambert, now the acknowledged head of the army, oppose it, but Desborough, Cromwell's brother-in-law, and Fleetwood, who had married his daughter Bridget, Ireton's widow, and was then Lord Deputy of Ireland, told him plainly they would not support him in it. "With these he entered into much discourse on the subject, and argued for it. He said it was a tempting of God to expose so many worthy men to death and poverty, when there was a certain way to secure them. The others insisted still on the oaths they had taken. He said those oaths were against the power and tyranny of Kings, but not against the four letters that made the word *King*. In conclusion they, believing from his discourse that he intended to accept of it, told him they saw great confusions would follow on it, and as they could not serve him, to set up the idol they had put down, and had sworn to keep down,

* Cornish, pp. 368 9.

so they would not engage in anything against him, but would retire and look on. So they offered him their commissions, since they were resolved not to serve a King; he desired they would stay till they heard his answer.”*

Oliver was very slow to give his answer, putting it off time after time, hoping, no doubt, for some favourable turn; but no such turn came. On the contrary, delay increased and strengthened opposition to his design. The known dislike of Lambert, Desborough, and Fleetwood to the project gave courage to the inferior officers, who formed themselves into a permanent council, and passed votes against the assumption of the title of King. Cromwell was waited on by about one hundred of them, who made him acquainted with their sentiments. This sensibly impressed him. The officers followed up their success by coming before Parliament with a petition against the revival of monarchy, to abolish which they had, they said, hazarded everything; and as they now observed some people trying again to bring the nation under the old servitude, they begged the House would discountenance all such persons, and remain steadfast to the old cause, for the preservation of which, they declared themselves ready to lay down their lives. This petition astounded both Cromwell and the House. Oliver was foiled, so he sent for the members to Whitehall, and with great ostentation of self-denial, refused the title of King.†

He spent a great deal of the public money in paying spies, for “he laid down as a maxim to spare no cost or charge, in order to procure himself intelligence.”‡ When he understood what dealers the Jews were everywhere, and that their chief trade depended on news, as they dealt so much in money, he brought a number of them over to England, and gave them leave to build a synagogue, not through toleration, but because they would be “good and sure spies for him.” Burnet says the Earl of Orrery told him the following anecdote: The Earl was, on a certain day, walking with Cromwell in one of the galleries of Whitehall, when a man almost in rags came in view. Cromwell at once dismissed Orrery and took the man into his closet. Some time afterwards Sir Jeremy Smith, who lay in the Downs with some ships, made a great prize by seizing a Dutch vessel carrying a large sum of money belonging to Spain, for the Spanish army in the Netherlands. Smith knew the exact spot in the vessel

* Burnet, Vol. I., p. 98.

† Ludlow's Memoirs, 591.

‡ Burnet's Own Times, Vol. I., p. 99.

where the treasure was, and when he boarded her, he went directly and took possession of it. The next time Cromwell saw Orrery he told him it was the man in rags, whom he had seen a few days before, that gave him the information about the Dutch vessel.

He knew everything that passed in the King's [Charles the Second's] little Court, and none of his spies was ever discovered but one. A gentleman once asked Cromwell's leave to go abroad for some time, which was given on condition that he would not visit, or hold any communication with *Charles Stuart*. Charles the II. was then in Cologne. The gentleman broke his word with Cromwell, and arranged a night interview with Charles, who received the gentleman in the presence of three attendants only. He took his leave, having received a letter which he sewed within the crown of his hat. "On his return to England he came with confidence to Cromwell, and being demanded by him if he had punctually performed his promise; he answered that he had. But, said Cromwell, who was it that put out the candles when you spoke to Charles Stuart? This unexpected question somewhat startled him; but Cromwell proceeding, asked him what he said to him; to which the gentleman answered that he said nothing at all to him. Then, said Cromwell, did he not send a letter by you? The gentleman denying that also, Cromwell took his hat, and having found the letter, he sent him immediately to the Tower."*

Although Cromwell abolished English liberty, and set up in its place his own absolute will, there are some things he did for which Englishmen ought to be grateful. It was chiefly during his Protectorate that England obtained the supremacy of the sea, which she has never lost. Blake, no doubt, deserves the chief credit of this, but he was well supported by Cromwell, whose heart and soul were in the work. He made England feared and respected by foreign nations; so that his ambassadors were as much honoured as (if not more than) those that represented royalty. In 1672 when Charles the II. was seeking for causes of quarrel with the Dutch, he accused them of harbouring in their country rebels to his government. To this Borel, the Dutch ambassador, replied, that it was an old principle with the

* One of the three persons present at the King's interview with the above gentleman, was a spy of Cromwell's named Manning. He had been sent to the King by Cromwell with a considerable sum of money, most of which he gave him, dividing the rest among his needy courtiers. He pretended to be a royalist sent to aid the King by friends, who, through fear of consequences, concealed their names. He was received into great favour, and was consequently one of the three attendants present at the interview.—Ludlow, pp. 608-9.

Dutch to receive all strangers who came to live amongst them, unless they were concerned in conspiracies against the persons of Princes. The King thereupon reminded him of the way in which he and his brother were treated when they were in Holland. Borel, "with great simplicity," answered: "Ah, Sire, that was quite another thing. Cromwell was a great man, and made himself feared by land and sea."* "This," says Burnet, "was very rough." The King's answer was, "I shall also make myself feared in my turn;" but he was scarce as good as his word.

Cromwell was very devoted to his family, and took every occasion to advance and enrich them, but with little result. His sons were good-for-nothing creatures; his daughters, however, more especially Lady Falconbridge, were much superior to them in good sense and talents. It was thought that Cromwell at one time entertained the project of bringing back Charles the II. on the condition of marrying one of his daughters. During the "heats" about making him King, Lord Orrery called on him and told him he had been in the city all day, whereupon Cromwell asked him what news he had heard there. The other answered that he was told he was in treaty with the King, who was to be restored and to marry his daughter. As Cromwell expressed no indignation at this, Lord Orrery concluded that he had often thought of that expedient.† His hatred of popery was of the most intense kind; he regarded himself as chosen to wreak God's vengeance on papists, just as the leaders of God's people under the old law were chosen to destroy His enemies.‡ He seems to have digested a very comprehensive plan for fighting

* "Ha ! Sire, c'était une autre chose ; Cromwell était un grand homme, et il se faisait craindre et par terre et par mer."—Burnet's History of his own Time, Vol. I., p. 115.

† When his daughter, Mary, was married to Lord Falconbridge, in November, 1657, the event was announced in the Court Gazette, as follows: "Whitehall, Tuesday, November 17. Yesterday afternoon his highness went to Hampton-court, and this day the most illustrious lady, the lady Mary Cromwell, third daughter of his highness the lord Protector, was there married—to the most noble lord, Falconbridge, in the presence of their highnesses and many noble persons."—*Mercurius Politicus*, Nov. 19. It was commonly believed that she had been previously married privately to Lord Falconbridge by Dr. Hewitt, an Episcopalian minister, whom her father beheaded for having been concerned in a royalist conspiracy. This, if true, would account for the efforts of Mrs. Claypole, and all the Cromwell family, together with Lord Falconbridge, to save him. Neither were their efforts without fruit, for Oliver made the vast concession of allowing his head to be cut off instead of having him hanged !

‡ "When the King was beheaded the native Irish were next punished by General Cromwell, who, they say, made his soldiers believe the Irish ought to be dealt with as the Canaanites in Joshua's time."—Anderson's Royal Genealogies, p. 786. London, 1736.

Rome with spiritual weapons, somewhat like her own. Burnet gives the following outline of it: "Stoupe told me a great design Cromwell had intended to begin his Kingship with, if he had assumed it. He resolved to set up a council for the protestant religion, in opposition to the congregation *de Propaganda fide* at Rome. He intended it should consist of seven councillors, and four secretaries for different provinces. These were; the first France, Switzerland, and the Valleys; the Palatinate and the other Calvinists were the second; Germany, the North, and Turkey were the third; and the East and West Indies the fourth. The secretaries were to have £500 salary a piece, and to keep a correspondence everywhere, to know the state of religion all over the world, that so all good designs might be by their means protected and assisted. Stoupe was to have the first province. They were to have a fund of £10,000 a year at their disposal for ordinary emergencies, but to be further supplied as occasion should require it. Chelsea College was to be made up for them, which was then an old decayed building, that had been at first raised to be a college for controversy." Burnet thought it a pity that such a "noble design" was not carried out.*

Cromwell called the battle of Worcester "the crowning victory;" the word "crowning" having been used not, perhaps, without design. He was from that time observed to assume more dignity and importance, and he began to cast off his old friends for new ones. Sometime after he became Protector, those creatures whom he made use of to put forward his wishes without committing himself to them, began to speak of him as "*His Highness*, the Lord Protector." When he was obliged to refuse the title of King from the opposition it met with, his powers were enlarged under the new or second Protectorate, and his title was improved to "*Serene Highness*." He was also authorised to name his successor in that office. He played King as much as any one could, without the actual title, and the man, who with great show of zeal for liberty freed England from the personal government of Charles, soon began to govern with far greater tyranny than ever Charles did. "He assembled and dismissed Parliaments with similar forms he would a court-martial. He tried four, and at his death he meditated a fifth. The difficulty he experienced in finding any representative body, however constituted, to sanction his usurpation, shows the unpopularity of his government, and the generally diffused

* Burnet, p. 109.

sentiment in favour of a more legal and responsible administration His government was a naked despotism, dependent entirely on the soldiery for support. Like all power grasped by violence, it could only be maintained by violence."*

There was much cruelty, not to say bloodthirstiness, in Cromwell's nature. After victory had at length declared for the Parliament forces at Marston Moor, the victors continued the pursuit and slaughter of Rupert's flying battalions. "Cromwell was always cruel in the chace," and, bloodhound-like, could not be drawn off. Fairfax did all he could to stay the slaughter. "'Spare the poor deluded countrymen,' he cried; and rode all over the field to enforce his orders, forgetful of himself and his wounds, and never more merciful than in victory; the prince of Puritan heroes.†" Sir Henry Slingsby and Dr. Hewitt were condemned for being concerned in a royalist plot. Both were connected with Cromwell's family, and great sympathy was expressed for them. His two daughters, Lady Falconbridge and Mrs. Claypole, pleaded hard with their father to pardon them. Mrs. Claypole, his favourite daughter, used all her influence with him to forgive Dr Hewitt. It was no use; he had them both beheaded. Mrs. Claypole sickened and soon died; all believed her death was hastened by Dr. Hewitt's execution. Oliver himself not long after sickened and died very unexpectedly, his death having been hastened by Mrs. Claypole's, whose bedside he never left for a whole fortnight before her death. What a miserable ending!‡ Three days before his death a hurricane, Wade says, swept over England, the greatest storm of wind that ever was known, and although it was felt in other places as well as in England, people connected it with Cromwell's illness. His friends asserted that God would not remove so great a man from this world without previously warning the nation of its approaching loss; his enemies, the cavaliers, maintained that the devils, "the princes of the air," were congregating over Whitehall that they might pounce upon his soul the moment it left his body. The third day after this he had a lucid interval of considerable duration, and he asked Sterry, one of his chaplains, "Is it possible to fall from grace?" "It is not possible," replied Sterry. "Then," exclaimed the dying man, "I am safe, for I know I was once in grace." Resting on this answer, which tallied exactly with his own often expressed belief, he felt no

* British History Chronologically Arranged. By John Wade, 3rd Ed., p. 205.

† See Cornish's Life of Cromwell, p. 74.

‡ Cornish, p. 402.

necessity to pray for himself, but he began to pray for God's people; his prayers for the most part expressing an indirect eulogium on himself. The opinion of a contemporary on Cromwell's appearance and character is worthy of a place here. "On September the 3rd [qr. 30th], died the Protector, Oliver Cromwell, one of the greatest and bravest men, had his cause been good, the world has produced. For his actions, I leave them to be inquired after in history; for his person, having never seen him very near but once, at the audience of an ambassador in Whitehall, I can only give this description of him, that his figure did no ways promise what he performed. He was personable [of good presence], but not handsome, nor did he look great or bold. He was plain in his apparel, and rather affected a negligence than a genteel garb. He had tears at his will, and was certainly the deepest dissembler on earth."* Viewed in the light of history, such a man, to my seeming, was Oliver Cromwell. He died on the 30th of September, 1658, in the 60th year of his age. It was the anniversary of his two great victories, Dunbar and Worcester; at the first he annihilated the great Scotch army, at the second the cause of the King and the Cavaliers was for the time crushed.

Recently, more than one pretentious volume on Cromwell's career has been published by writers who seem to glory in following in the track of Carlyle. These books are not histories; they are rather prose epics with Oliver for a hero.† I do not include Mr. Cornish's *Life of the Protector* in this category. Many would think him too lenient, and his work has a tendency in that direction, but it is nevertheless an honest and well balanced biography. If the Parliament which Cromwell had summoned a short time before his death, but which he did not live to meet, would not have made him King, Mr. Cornish is of opinion that he would have assumed the title and office by his own authority.

Having said so much of Cromwell's career and character we must now go back to 1649, the year in which he entered upon his Irish campaign.

* *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby*, p. 39. Elsewhere Sir John says, referring to the above audience, "I scarce saw him very near but once about that time, (for being fearful of himself he was not easy of access), when he gave public audience to the Spanish ambassador, whom he received with as much distance and ceremony as if he had been the greatest of Kings."

† One of the most masterly pieces of writing in Lingard's *England* is his character of Cromwell; it is severe enough, but cannot be called unjust.

CHAPTER XVIII.

AFTER the king's death, when the Parliament began to look into the state of their affairs in Ireland, they found them in a very low condition, and had not Ormonde with supreme folly, resulting from his hatred of the Catholics, given up Dublin to Jones, they would not have had a place of any importance in it, but Derry. Nor would they be in possession of that city, but for Ormonde's refusing to accede to O'Neill's terms until it was too late.* The Parliament resolved to send a numerous and well provided army to Ireland, and on the 28th of March, 1649, Cromwell was appointed its general-in-chief. This appointment was not made without much discussion and intrigue. The House consisted of two principal parties, the Presbyterians and the Independents, and a contention arose between them as to whether Fairfax or Cromwell should be sent to Ireland. Fairfax was regarded as a Presbyterian and Cromwell always acted with the Independents. Waller, a Presbyterian General, was first of all proposed as commander of the expedition, and Lord-Deputy besides. Cromwell did not oppose this at first, and it was even thought he would be glad to be rid of Waller and his officers, whom he knew were not his friends; but his plans were so secret and his movements so tortuous, that it was always nearly impossible to divine what he really wished, until his policy would be developed by time. When he found Waller demanding large supplies and a well disciplined army for the service, he began to fear danger from having a man of Waller's reputation and military talents placed at the head of such a force. So he got his creatures in the House to "cross" the design of appointing Waller. Alleging the extravagance of his demands in both men and money, they opposed the first as more than was necessary for the service, and the second as more than they could spare in view of other demands.† When this check was put to Waller's appointment Cromwell caused Lambert to be proposed, as he was one of his firm supporters. His object in this is pretty evident. He did not wish to leave England at the time; things continued in such confusion since the King's death. The Levellers had grown very troublesome and

* Inchiquin.

† See Clarendon's Rebellion, Vol. III., Part 1, p. 121.

even dangerous; and he feared his absence in Ireland would give an opportunity to his enemies, who were not few, to work mischief against him. But when political "heats" had cooled down, he changed his mind, and doubtless ambitioned the prestige it would give him to go as Generalissimo and Lord Lieutenant to Ireland, subdue it, and on his return be received as a conqueror. He was proposed for the post by men who knew his wishes, and it was accordingly offered to him. He affected to hesitate. At his request two officers from each corps received orders to meet him at Whitehall, and seek the Lord in prayer, and after a delay of two weeks, he went down to the House, bathed in tears and bowed down "with his own unworthiness and disability to support so great a charge." Still, "he resigned himself to their commands," placing "his absolute dependence upon God's providence and blessing."*

Although Cromwell's appointment was made at the end of March, 1649, he did not take his departure from London until towards the middle of July. The interval was employed in active preparations for his campaign, and in dealing some crushing blows to the Levellers. At length, on the 10th of that month he set out with more than regal splendour for Bristol. "He went forth in that state and equipage as the like hath hardly been seen; himself in a coach with six gallant Flanders mares, whitish grey, and divers coaches accompanying him; his life guard consisted of eighty gallant gentlemen, many of whom were colonels, and the meanest whereof was a commander or esquire, in stately habit, with trumpets sounding."† Not bad for so humble a Christian. "On the day of his departure his friends assembled at Whitehall; three ministers solemnly invoked the blessing of God on the arms of the saints; and three officers, Goff, Harrison, and the Lord Lieutenant himself, expounded the Scriptures 'excellently well and pertinently to the occasion.'"[‡] He arrived at Bristol on the 14th, where he remained nearly a month, for reasons not easily accounted for; but the most probable of them is that his onward movement was checked by the desertion of many of his men and the reluctance of most of them to embark. At length he set sail on the 13th of August with thirty-two ships, Ireton following two days later with the main body of the army in forty-two vessels.

He wrote a letter to his daughter Dorothy, "from aboard the John, 13th August, 1649." It is very affectionate; there is a

* *Ibid.*, 322; Lingard, Vol. VIII., p. 133.

† *Moderate Intelligencer* of 10th July, 1649, in *Cromwelliana*.

‡ Lingard, Vol. VIII., p. 134.

postscript to it about borrowing "her father's nag," when she goes abroad, which is playful and even jocular. On this letter Carlyle remarks:—"These gentle domesticities and pieties are strangely contrasted with the fiery savagery and iron grimness, stern as doom which meets us in the next set of letters we have from him."*

Cromwell arrived in Dublin on the 15th August where, we are told, he was received with the acclamations of the people and the firing of the great guns. Having arrived at a convenient place, he made a speech which has not come down to us, but the purport of it was, "That as God had brought him thither in safety, so he doubted not but by Divine Providence to restore them all to their just liberties and properties, much trodden down by those unblessed Papist-Royalist combinations and the injuries of war;" "and that all persons whose heart's affections were real for the carrying out of this great work against the barbarous and bloodthirsty Irish and their confederates and adherents, and for the propagating of Christ's Gospel, and establishing of Truth and Peace, and restoring of this bleeding nation of Ireland to its former happiness and tranquillity,—should find favour and protection from the Parliament of England and him, and withal receive such rewards and gratuities as might be answerable to their merits." "This speech," say the old newspapers, "was entertained with great applause by the people; who all cried out, we will live and die with you."† "After our army had refreshed themselves," says Ludlow, "and were joined by the forces of Colonel Jones, they marched in all between sixteen and seventeen thousand horse and foot."‡

One of the first things Cromwell did on his arrival in Dublin was to publish a Declaration against robbery and pillage, and against cruelty to the country people. This declaration was strictly enforced and, besides being so just in itself, gave confidence to the people to come to the army with provisions in such abundance that no army could have been more plentifully supplied with all necessaries than Oliver's.

He remained 16 days in Dublin to rest his army, and await the coming of Ireton who did not arrive till ten days after him. He began his march to Drogheda on the 31st of August, and came before it on the 3rd of September, his fortunate day. I

* Letters and Speeches, p. 39. 3 Vol. Ed.

† Carlyle: Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, Vol. II., pp. 39-40. No doubt Oliver measured the value of this applause by the opinion he expressed to Lambert on their way to Scotland about a year later. See p. 313.

‡ Memoirs, p. 301.

pass over any detailed account of the operations before and within the town, as these are very fully given in most of the histories of the period.* On his arrival, Cromwell sent a summons to Sir Arthur Aston,† the then Governor. It ran as follows:—

“September 10th, 1649.

“SIR,—Having brought the army belonging to the Parliament of England before this place, to reduce it to obedience, to the end effusion of blood may be prevented, I thought fit to summons you to deliver the same into my hands to their use. If this be refused, you will have no cause to blame me. I expect your answer, and rest Your servant,

“O. CROMWELL.

This summons, which is rather suggestive than outspoken, reads fair enough, with the exception that Cromwell could not justly throw the blame of the bloodshed that might result from defending the town on Aston, who had quite as good a right to defend it as Cromwell had to attack it. So the bloodshed must be divided between them. Aston having refused to accede to Cromwell's demand, the latter began active hostilities by playing with his great guns on the part of the wall near St. Mary's Church, on the South side of the town. “On the 10th of this instant,” he writes to Lenthall the Speaker, “having beat down the corner tower and opened two reasonable good breaches in the East and South wall, about five o'clock in the evening we began the storm.” “The garrison fought with extreme courage. Twice after forcing their way into the town the storming party were beaten back through the breach. The third time, as the light was waning, Cromwell led them up in person, forced Aston upon his inner lines, stormed those lines in turn, and before night fell was master of Drogheda.”‡

The “no quarter” carnage of Drogheda lives in tradition as well as in our annals; and the “Curse of Cromwell on you,” continues to be a malediction in Ireland, and is likely to die out only with the Irish race.

The promise of quarter and the breach of that promise through

* See Cromwell in Ireland, by Rev. Denis Murphy, S.J. Dalton's History of Drogheda, &c.

† The name is variously written Aston, Ashton, and by the English officer of Clottworthy's regiment, Austin.

‡ Froude's English in Ireland, Vol. I., p. 124. Cromwell “stormed the third time, himself in the head of them, till he went to the breach, and then stepped by under the wall to see his men enter, which, after a hard fight, they did.” History of the Wars of Ireland by a British Officer in Sir J. Clottworthy's Regiment, p. 87.

Cromwell's later command of "No quarter," call for a dispassionate examination, as far as one can be dispassionate in presence of such savage butchery. It is clear that Cromwell was resolved to strike a blow in Drogheda that would terrify Ireland; and for this he prepared the garrison in the above summons to Aston.

The giving or refusing of quarter in war seems to depend primarily on the will of the Commander-in-Chief, but cases must arise in which it ought to be given in his absence, and ought to be ratified by him. It is contrary to the practice of civilized warfare to refuse quarter unless under very exceptional circumstances; and it would be unwise as well as bloodthirsty to tell the enemy at the outset that unless he yields at once he will receive no quarter; for in that case he would be driven to adopt the same course, which would lead to such carnage as should be called murder rather than warfare. Although Oliver does not plainly threaten this extreme course in the above summons, he, with his usual cunning, leaves it to be inferred, and the inference was verified by what actually happened. A commander can issue the order—"No quarter," but he must submit to be judged by the circumstances in which he does so. One who writes with authority on this subject, says, "The refusal of quarter is a terrible aggravation of the horrors of war, and is only at all justifiable towards an enemy who has been guilty of atrocious cruelty himself, or of some flagrant breach of faith." As no terms were made by the garrison, there could be no breach of faith; and throughout the siege and storming there is not one act of cruelty charged against them.

There is no little confusion in the different authorities, as to the giving of quarter and the order of "no quarter" at the storming and, we may well add, the *Sack* of Drogheda. Inchi-quin, writing to Ormonde from Castlejordan, on the 15th of September, says, "Many men and some officers have made their escape out of Drogheda . . . some out of every regiment have come unto me;" all of whom, he says, declare that "no man had quarter with Cromwell's leave."* This most probably refers to the quarter given by Cromwell's officers at the breach, for there can be no doubt that at some period of the contest there quarter was promised to the defenders, if they would lay down their arms. This they did, and for a certain time received the quarter promised, as will be seen by the authorities hereafter quoted.

1. The author of *Cambrensis Eversus* says Cromwell could

* Aphorism. Discovery, Vol. II., Preface XXVIII.

not take the town until its defenders had received a promise of their lives from some person of high rank in his army.*

2. The Marquis of Ormonde, to whom some of the fugitives from Drogheda must have also gone, says in his letters to the King and Lord Byron, "that on this occasion Cromwell exceeded himself and anything he had ever done in breach of faith and bloody inhumanity; and that the cruelties exercised there for five days† after the town was taken, would make as many several pictures of inhumanity as are to be found in the book of martyrs, or in the relation of Amboyna."‡ "All the officers and soldiers of Cromwell's army," says Carte, "promised quarter to such as would lay down their arms, and performed it as long as any place held out, which encouraged others to yield. But when they had once all in their power, and feared no hurt that could be done to them, Cromwell being told by Jones that he had now all the flower of the Irish army in his hands, gave orders that no quarter should be given; so that his soldiers were forced, many of them against their will, to kill their prisoners."§

3. As far as I can see my way through this "quarter" and "no quarter" question, I think there was an intention from the beginning of the attack to give no quarter. As I have said above, this intention is foreshadowed in Cromwell's summons to Aston, and it receives strong confirmation from his letter to Bradshaw, dated September 16th, 1649. He there says:—"The enemy had made three retrenchments, both to the right and left, where we entered; all which they were forced to quit; being thus entered, we refused them quarter, having the day before summoned the town." So that the summons to Aston was, in Oliver's opinion, a sufficient justification for refusing quarter. The quarter spoken of above, therefore, was given by his officers only for a time and for a purpose.||

* Cambrensis Eversus, Vol. III., p. 187, Dub. Ed.

† How could it continue five days when the storming began on the 11th, and the army marched from Drogheda on the 15th? It may be explained in this way: on the departure of the army several individuals who had succeeded in concealing themselves, crept out of their hiding-places, but did not elude the vigilance of the garrison by whom they were put to the sword.—Bates's Rise and Progress, part ii., p. 27, quoted by Dr. Lingard in Appendix, SSS., Vol. VIII.

‡ Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 84. Echard's History of England, Vol. I., p. 676.

§ Carte *ib.* Amboyna, the principal of the Molucca isles, was taken from the Portuguese by the Dutch in 1605. The English factors were tortured and put to death there, 17 Feb., 1623-4, by the Dutch, on an accusation of a conspiracy to expel them from the island. Cromwell compelled the Dutch to give a sum of money to the descendants of the sufferers.

|| It appears that this kind of quarter was given in other places besides Drogheda. "If the promise was made by the officer, they were told it was not

4. From the above extract of Cromwell's letter to Bradshaw it appears that he gave the order of no quarter as soon as his troops succeeded in entering the town, and hence it is evident that the order was repeated with special reference to Aston and the officers and soldiers who were in the Millmount, for Aston was a brave soldier, and he would not have retired to the Millmount until he saw the town was taken. Cromwell's own words sustain this view: he says, "the enemy retreated divers of them into the Millmount, a place very strong and difficult of access; . . . the governor, Sir Arthur Ashton, and divers considerable officers being there, our men getting up to them, *were ordered by me to put them all to the sword.*"* Lingard thinks the Millmount was delivered up on promise of quarter, which was broken by the above order of Cromwell. He is, deliberately, it would seem, confused and obscure in his despatches from Drogheda, in none of which does he say one word as to how the Millmount was taken. It was very strong—in fact the fortress of the town—and was defended by 250 picked men with the governor at their head. It could have been defended against any number brought against it, as long as provision and ammunition lasted; yet it seems to have been taken without any fighting! Hence there is great reason to believe that Dr. Lingard's surmise is correct, that quarter was promised and afterwards withdrawn, when the place was delivered up. This view is strongly corroborated by Inchiquin's letter to Ormonde quoted above. In it he says, "that the governor was killed in the Mill Mounte, after quarter given by the officer that came first there."†

he but the Colonel who had the power of granting such securities; but if the Colonel had made the promise, and they surrendered to him, then it was not he but the officer who was commanded to sign terms of capitulation; even though the officer had promised security if they surrendered, the victims were informed that none but the Commander-in-Chief was vested with such authority."—*Cambrensis Eversus*, Vol. III., pp. 185-7. So that by this chicanery the promise of quarter was ignored whenever it was thought convenient to do so.

Very important light is thrown on this "quarter" and "no quarter" question by what occurred later on at the Siege of Limerick, as recorded in the following entry:—"Monday, 16th June, 1651. By a great shott made at the castle below the island, 3 of the enemy being slaine and others wounded, the rest betook themselves to their cotts, but being shot at by our musquetiers they came to the shoare, who were after put to the sword: of these there were 14. This being done by command of Coll. Totthill, *they having quarter given them by the souldiers*, he was at a Martiall Court put therefore from his command."—*Diary of Parliamentary Forces*. Aphor. Disc., Vol. II., p. 232. The italics in the extract are mine.—J. O'R. The above proceedings under court-martial were instituted under Ireton's special directions.

* Letter to Lenthal.

† Aston's wooden leg has been mentioned by all who have written about the storm of Drogheda. He fell from his horse when he was governor of Oxford,

Cromwell, in his letter to Bradshaw was careful to say nothing about any of the inhabitants having been killed. "I do believe," he writes, "we put to the sword the whole number of the defendants . . . I do not think thirty of the whole number escaped with their lives, those who did are in safe custody for Barbadoes." Thomas Wood, eldest brother of Anthony Wood, author of *Athenæ Oxonienses*, was in Ingoldsby's regiment at the storming and Sack of Drogheda. He was a student of Oxford, and was one of the first who threw off his gown "and ran to Edgehill battle." He was deeply engaged in the Cavalier plot in the year 1648, and to avoid being taken and hanged for it, he fled to Ireland, where he met his former college friend, Henry Ingoldsby, then a Colonel in Cromwell's army, and became a lieutenant in his regiment. After the taking of Drogheda, "he returned to Oxford to take up his arrears at Ch. Church and to settle his other affairs, at which time, being often with his mother and his brethren, he would tell them of the most terrible assaulting and storming of Tredagh [Drogheda], wherein he himself had been engaged. He told them that three thousand at least, besides some women and children, were, *after the assailants had taken part, and afterwards all the town*, put to the sword on the 11th

broke his leg, and so had to get a wooden one. He was reputed to be a miser, and it was said that for safety he had stowed away a sum of money in the hollow part of his wooden leg. When Cromwell's soldiers had killed him or had put him *hors de combat*, they fought among themselves for possession of the leg, but finding it empty, they battered in his skull with it, and "hacked" his body to pieces with indignation at the disappointment. In the earlier part of his letter to Lenthall, dated a day later, he repeats substantially the same information, but towards the end he says: "It is remarkable that these people at first set up the Mass in some places of the town that had been monasteries; but afterwards grew so insolent, that the last Lord's day before the storm, the Protestants were thrust out of the great church, called St. Peter's, and they had public Mass there,"—a dreadful crime in Oliver's eyes, and hence the speedy retribution which he relates in the next sentence with evident glee: "And in this very place near one thousand of them were put to the sword, flying thither for safety. I believe all their fryers were knockt on the head promiscuously, but two. The one was father Peter Taaff, brother of Lord Taaff, whom the soldiers took the next day and made an end of; the other was taken in the Round Tower under the repute of a lieutenant, and when he understood the officers in that tower had no quarter, he confessed he was a fryer, but *that did not save him*." The thousand slaughtered in St. Peter's church were not armed defenders, they were helpless townspeople, *but that did not save them*. "They had set up the Mass;" that was justification abundant to Oliver and the Puritan Parliament of England for their slaughter. The Catholics of Drogheda did set up the Mass to this extent that when they had closed their gates, "making their first appeal to heaven, Mass was solemnly celebrated in St. Mary's Convent," which had been founded three hundred years before for the celebration of Mass. And surely the good people of Drogheda never stood in greater need of making their peace with heaven, and solemnly offering up the Spotless Victim for their sins, than when they heard Cromwell was approaching their gates.

and 12th of September, 1649, at which time St. Arthur Aston, the governour, had his brains beat out, and his body hack'd to pieces. He told them, that when they were to make the way up to the loft and galleries in the church, and up to the tower where the enemy had fled, each of the assailants would take up a child, and use it as a buckler of defence, when they ascended the steps, to keep themselves from being shot or brain'd. After they had kill'd all in the church, they went into the vaults underneath, where all the flower and choicest of the women and ladies had hid themselves. One of those, a most handsome virgin, arrai'd in costly and gorgeous apparel, kneeled down to Tho. Wood with tears and prayers to save her life. And being struck with a profound pitie took her under his arme, went with her out of the church, with intentions to put her over the works to shift for herself, but a soldier perceiving his intentions ran her through with his sword. Whereupon Mr. Wood seeing her gasping, took away her money, jewells, &c., and flung her down over the works, &c."*

"For successive days during which this butchery continued, neither place, sex, religion or age was respected; youths and virgins, infants as well as those feeble with years, were, everywhere slaughtered by the barbarians. Four thousand Catholic men (to say nothing of the vast multitude of religious, women, young people of both sexes and infants), fell by the swords of those impious rebels, during the sack of that city."†

Cromwell's own view of the taking of Drogheda was that God, rather than himself or his soldiers, did the work. In his letter to Bradshaw, he says, "This hath been a marvellous great mercy." And again: "I wish that all honest hearts may give the glory of this to God alone, to whom indeed the praise of this mercy belongs, for instruments they were very inconsiderable throughout." To Speaker Lenthall he writes:—"I am persuaded that this is a righteous judgment of God upon these barbarous wretches who have imbued their hands with so much innocent blood." There is no truth whatever in this assertion. The soldiers who defended Drogheda against Cromwell were in no way connected with the so-called massacre of 1641: neither had the people of Drogheda any hand in it, that town being

* *Athenæ Oxonienses*. London: 1815, Ed. Bliss, Vol. I., pp. xix, xx, quoted in *Aphor. Discovery*, Vol. II., p. 275. Obs.—"Ran her through with his sword" is not Mr. Wood's expression, but the actual way in which she was murdered is too horrible to be placed before human eyes.

† *Propugnaculum Cathol. Veritatis*, lib. iv. c. 14, p. 678. By Father Bruodin, whom Dr. Lingard calls "An Irish friar of great eminence and authority in the Franciscan Order."—See Lingard, Vol. VIII. Appendix, p. 315.

then held successfully, and defended against Sir Phelim O'Neill by Sir Henry Tichborne, an English Officer. In another part of the letter he says:—"And now give me leave to say how it comes to pass that this work was wrought; it was set upon some of our hearts that a great thing should be done, not by power or might, but by the Spirit of God; and is not this clear? That which caused your men to storm so courageously, it was the Spirit of God, who gave your men courage, and took it away again, and gave the enemy courage, and took it away again, and gave your men courage again, and therewith this happy success; and therefore it is good that God alone have all the glory."

Had Oliver been an apostolic missionary to the heathen, he would not have written home more humbly or unctuously about his labours, than he does regarding the no-quarter slaughter of Drogheda. Others, however, have looked at the storming and sack of that town from a different standpoint. I give below the opinions of some Protestant historians on the subject.

"Though quarter had been promised by his officers," says Mr. Taylor, "Cromwell refused to ratify the agreement, and ordered the garrison to be put to the sword. The inhuman massacre was continued during the two following days. Thirty of the brave defenders of Drogheda alone survived; and these, by a dubious mercy, were sold as slaves to the plantations. The excuse for this atrocious barbarity was the necessity of striking immediate terror into the Irish in order to prevent them from future opposition. It failed, as such detestable policy always must; and, had Owen O'Neill lived, the effects would have been the direct contrary."*

"For five days this hideous execution was continued with every circumstance of horror. A number of ecclesiastics was found within the walls; and Cromwell, as if immediately commissioned to execute divine vengeance on these ministers of idolatry, ordered his soldiers to plunge their weapons into the helpless wretches."†

"The place," writes Warner, "was immediately taken by storm; and though his officers and soldiers had promised quarter to all that would lay down their arms, yet Cromwell ordered that

* History of the Civil Wars in Ireland. By W. C. Taylor, A.B., Trin. Coll. Dublin, Vol. II., p. 21.

† The History of Ireland from the Invasion. By Thomas Leland, D.D., Senior Fellow of Trinity College, and Prebendary of St. Patrick's, Dublin, Vol. III., p. 350, 4to. Ed.

no quarter should be given, and none was given accordingly. The slaughter continued all that day and the next, and the governour and four colonels were killed in cool blood : ' which extraordinary severity,' says Ludlow—' I presume was used to discourage others from making opposition.' But are men to divest themselves of humanity, and to turn themselves into devils, because policy may suggest that they will succeed better as devils than as men ! ”*

Mr. Carlyle has had his say about the sack of Drogheda, and I shall close the account of it by quoting the view of that great worshipper of Oliver's. " Oliver's proceedings here," he says, " have been the theme of much loud criticism and sibylline execration ; into which it is not our place to enter at present. We shall give these Irish letters of his in their own natural figure, and without any commentary whatever. . To those who think that a land overrun with sanguinary Quacks, can be healed by sprinkling it with rose-water, these letters must be very horrible. Terrible Surgery this ; but *is* it Surgery and Judgment, or atrocious murder merely ? That is a question which should be asked ; and answered. Oliver Cromwell did believe in God's Judgments ; and did not believe in the rose-water plan of Surgery, which, in fact, is the editor's case too."† Surgery is an important branch of the healing art, but what curing or healing was done by Cromwell's no-quarter Surgery in Drogheda, the great philosopher, Thomas, saith not ; and there are many who think that instead of healing, he only left gaping wounds which no after-Surgery has been able to close.

Immediately after the capture and sack of Drogheda, Cromwell sent Col. Chidley Coote northwards. He appeared before Dundalk, and it fell without a blow. A part of Cromwell's army, probably led by himself, went westwards to Trim, but the place had been abandoned by Major Ponsonby before his arrival, and in such haste too, that Ormonde's order to burn it, should Drogheda be taken, was not carried out. Carlingford and Newry surrendered to Venables, as did Lisburn and Belfast. Sir Charles Coote, governor of Derry, took Coleraine, putting the garrison to the sword as was his habit. So that by the end of September every place of importance in Ulster, except Carrickfergus, was in the hands of Cromwell's forces. He himself proceeded southwards, marching by the seashore to keep his com-

* The History of the Rebellion and Civil War in Ireland, by Ferdo. Warner, LL.D. Second Ed. p. 470.

† Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, by Thomas Carlyle, Vol. II., p. 45. 3 Vol. Ed.

munications open. He took Col. Michael Jones with him as his lieutenant, leaving Colonel Hewson in command of Dublin. "Wexford being his next design, he wrote to the inhabitants, and courted them to submit to his authority and to quit the royal interest, and that they should enjoy all their possessions and fortunes, and be as well used as any others under his power."* So wrote the man who gloried in knocking priests on the head in Drogheda, and in slaughtering more than a thousand of all ages and sexes in St. Peter's Church, because they were Papists. All the strong places between Dublin and Wexford—Kilnacarrick, Limbrick,† Ferns, Enniscorthy—cleared out before the all-conquering Oliver, or yielded to his summons.

On Saturday, the 29th of September, Cromwell's fleet appeared off the harbour of Wexford, and on the 1st of October, he and his army encamped before the walls.

For our purpose, there is no need to dwell at much length on the scenes enacted at Wexford. It was Drogheda repeated. Wexford was strong, and the towns-people showed a disinclination to admit a garrison for their defence, and they are blamed, in this, for pride and too much self-reliance, but it is hard to see on whom they could safely rely except themselves. Ormonde was unworthy of their trust, for his whole career proved he hated the religion which he had professed at the age of fifteen, and which it was their object and sacred duty to defend. He persistently opposed every concession to the Catholics; he professed himself so devoted to the King, that he was prepared to make any sacrifice for his interest but one. He declared he would sooner retire from his service than grant to the Catholics the concessions which the King not only empowered him, but wished and all but entreated him to grant.‡ And who were his lieutenants? The two principal were Taaffe and Preston, whose incapacity, or worse, lost to the Confederation the best armies they had ever put into the field, and whose mean, unpatriotic jealousies caused them to thwart, in every way they could, Owen O'Neill, the single man who was capable of

* Gale's History of Corporations in Ireland, Appendix CXXV : London, 1834, Quoted in "Cromwell in Ireland," p. 140.

† This was a castle belonging to Lord Esmonde, who in conjunction with Parsons robbed the O'Byrnes of their property, the Ranelaghs, as we have noted in the earlier part of this work.

‡ See Birch's Inquiry and other works quoted in the earlier part of this volume. Ormonde, for political reasons, was willing to give the Catholics certain concessions *during good behaviour*, but was always opposed to giving them legal recognition.

carrying to a successful issue the cause in which they had engaged. Furthermore, Inchiquin had become his trusted friend, an unprincipled soldier, who had repeatedly changed sides, the Cromwell of Cashel, who would knock priests and religious on the head with as much bloodthirsty coolness as Oliver himself. I have said above, that "the Curse of Cromwell" is still a malediction in Ireland. Something of the same kind exists in Munster with regard to Inchiquin. Morrogh O'Brien, Lord Inchiquin, was known far and wide as *Morrogh-na-tothaine*—Morrogh the Incendiary—because he fired every roof-tree he met in his desolating progress. There is a tradition about him, that he was a terrible looking man; and in the South, down to our days, if any one has a fierce, forbidding, truculent aspect, the common saying is, "He looks like Morrogh." His soldiers were in open mutiny against him, their wish being to join the Parliament forces; so that they would be more likely to open the gates of Wexford to Cromwell than to fight him.*

Such were the relievers of Wexford, whom Wexford feared to trust. Cromwell, to be sure, sat down before their town, reeking with the blood of Drogheda: but who was his lieutenant? Colonel Michael Jones, to whom Ormonde had delivered up Dublin rather than confide it to the Confederation, even though represented by his devoted friends Preston, Taaffe, and Castlehaven. But they were Catholics, whilst Jones, although a puritan rebel, had (to Ormonde) the supreme advantage of being a Protestant.†

The hesitation of the inhabitants of Wexford as to whether they would defend the town or deliver it up on terms, is very plainly stated by Colonel David Sinnott in his letter to the Marquis of Ormonde; he says:—"I find no resolution in the townsmen to defend the town, but to speak truth nakedly, I find and perceive them rather inclined to capitulate, and take conditions of the enemy; in so much as I cannot as yet find admittance for

* This feeling is strongly expressed in a pamphlet published a couple of weeks after the taking of Wexford, but evidently drawn up before that event. It is called "The Remonstrance and Resolution of the Protestant army of Munster now in Corke." It is signed by more than thirty officers, twelve of them being Colonels and L. Colonels. There occurs in it this passage, which indicates its spirit—"The late unhappy peace was no other but a meere submission of the Protestant Religion and the English Interest in this dominion, under the slavish and barbarous yoke of the Romish Church and Irish Anarchy." "Printed October 23rd, 1649," at London. *Halliday Pamphlets*, Box 62, Pamphlet 28, R. I. Academy. Inchiquin himself, it may be noted, had a great deal to do with the making of this peace.

† It is the common opinion that Ireland was lost to Charles by the treachery of Ormonde in delivering up Dublin to Jones; for this Jones amply repaid him at Rathmines, Drogheda, and Wexford.

those few assigned hither for the defence of the place, nor a muster of the townsmen to know what strength they have for the defence thereof, in which respect, seeing I am not able to do his Majesty any service, I am resolved to leave the town, without I find their undelayed conformity.”*

Three days after Sinnott had written this letter, negotiations were opened between himself and Cromwell; the result of which was that four Commissioners were sent out to treat about the terms on which the town would be delivered up. One of the four was William Stafford, who betrayed the Castle to Cromwell. After some parleying, Sinnott sent out conditions on which he was ready to give possession of the town and Castle to Cromwell. Oliver expressed strong indignation at those conditions, “which,” as he says, “for their abominableness, manifesting also the impudency of the men,” he enclosed to Speaker Lenthall, apparently as a kind of curiosity. Cromwell detained the four Commissioners whilst he was preparing his answer. By that answer he granted life and liberty to the soldiers; life, but not liberty, to the commissioned officers; and freedom from pillage to the inhabitants. This latter concession, however, was subject to the decision of Parliament with regard to their real property. He demanded an immediate acceptance of these terms, and the delivery to him of six hostages within an hour. But Stafford, the commandant of the Castle, having been, what Cromwell in his despatch calls, “*fairly treated*,” betrayed the Castle into his hands. Of this Sinnott, the governor, knew nothing, and whilst he and the townspeople were anxiously awaiting their commissioners with Cromwell’s answer, they saw to their horror and consternation Oliver’s colours planted on the Castle, which had been thrown open to him by Stafford, who seems to have gone into that stronghold with them, probably to prevent resistance from his own men. After this a paper containing the conditions was delivered to the other three Commissioners, “who had not the hearts to return to the town.” Thus Sinnott and the other authorities were left in ignorance of Cromwell’s decision. With regard to the answer to the proposition, he himself says it had no effect. “Few,” he adds, “whilst I was preparing it, studying to preserve the town from plunder, that it might be of more use to you and your Army,—the Captain, who was one of the Commissioners, being fairly treated, yielded up the Castle to us; upon the top of which our men no sooner appeared, but the

* Aphor. Disc., Vol. II., p. 282. Letter dated Wexford, last day of September, 1649. Sinnott, who was Lieutenant-Colonel of Preston’s regiment, was admitted into the town only the day before, when Cromwell’s ships appeared in the offing.

enemy quitted the walls of the Town ; which our men perceiving, ran violently upon the town, with their ladders and stormed it.”* Was not Oliver to the fore ? and had he not authority enough to prevent the slaughter, if he chose ? O yes, but he saw “ that God would not have it so ; ” wherefore, “ he thought it not good nor just, to restrain off the soldiers from their right of pillage, nor from doing execution on the enemy.”† There was no right of pillage ; there was no right of execution ; there was no right of attacking the town until his reply to the propositions had been delivered and rejected, which of course did not happen, as the three commissioners to whom it was delivered did not go back to the town. Oliver was always tremulously fearful lest men should appropriate to themselves the glory which was due to God alone. So he concludes his despatch to the Government in these words :—“ Thus it has pleased God to give into your hands this other mercy, for which, as for all, we pray God may have all the glory. Indeed, your instruments are poor and weak, and can do nothing but through believing, and that is the gift of God also.”‡ A modern historian indignantly asks: “ Did then the fanatic believe that perfidy and cruelty were gifts of God ? for at Wexford he could not plead, as at Drogheda, that his summons had been contemptuously rejected.” How could he, seeing that his summons was never delivered ?§

In places sacked, as Wexford was, it is almost impossible to find out the exact number of the slain. In the “ English Official Chronicle of Irish Wars,” we find this entry :—“ On the 11th October, his Excellency took Wexford by storm, and in it 51 peeces of ordnance, besides those in ships, 40 vessels in the harbour, great store of plunder, 2,000 were slaine of Ormonde’s soldiers in the town.”|| Cromwell himself says, “ I believe in all there was lost of the enemy not many less than two thousand, and I believe not twenty of yours killed, from first to last of the siege.”¶ Another account says that Cromwell “ entered the

* Letter to Lenthal of 14th October, 1649, written from Wexford.

† Letter of 16th October.

‡ Quoted in App. 159, Aphor. Disc., Vol. III.

§ Letter of October 14th, to Lenthal.

|| Cary’s Memorials, Vol. II., p. 180. Dr. Lingard calls Cromwell’s official account of the taking of Wexford, “ a matchless specimen of craft and mystification.” See Appendix, 883. Hist. Eng., Vol. VIII., pp. 316 & 317.

¶ A shot, it is said, was fired from the Castle against Cromwell, but this was only a ruse to show some appearance of resistance. “ One onely culverin was discharged from the Castle, but wittingly so high, that it could do no hurte, which Cromwell admiringe, said, ‘ What ! did the rogues shutt with bulletts ? ’ ” Aphor. Disc., Vol. II., p. 64. Permission, we may suppose, was given to Stafford to fire blank cartridge by way of resistance ; but as the sound of blank

town and put man, woman, and child to the sword, where among the rest the Governor lost his life, and others of the soldiers and inhabitants to the number of 1,500 persons.”* Dr. French, the Bishop of Ferns, writes of the sack of Wexford :—“ On that fatal day, 11th October, 1649, I lost everything I had. Wexford, my native town, then abounding in merchandize, ships, and wealth, was taken at the sword’s point by that plague of England, Cromwell, and sacked by an infuriated soldiery. Before God’s altar fell sacred victims, holy priests of the Lord. Of those who were seized outside the church, some were scourged, some thrown into chains and imprisoned, while others were hanged or put to death by cruel tortures. The blood of the noblest of our citizens was shed, so that it inundated the streets. There was hardly a house that was not defiled with carnage and filled with wailing.”†

Among the slain was a number of women and children, amounting to two, or as some say, to three hundred, who had assembled round the great cross in the market place, expecting it would be to them a sacred refuge. They had often knelt under its shadow seeking grace and mercy from Him whom it represented ; they were murdered clinging to it. Poor victims ! they little thought the sign of salvation to which they clung was regarded by Cromwell’s puritan soldiers as “ the mark of the beast,” and was contemptuously desecrated and broken into fragments by them wherever they met it.‡ The Franciscan Fathers seem to

cartridge is easily detected, Stafford probably loaded with ball, that the shot should have the proper ring in it, and fired high to avoid doing injury. Hence, Cromwell’s question.

* Gale’s Corporation System in Ireland, App. p. cxxvi.

† Letter to Papal Nuncio, dated Antwerp, January, 1673. Original given in *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, Vol. I. Letter CCLXI., p. 510. Translation in Rev. Dr. Moran’s *Historical Sketch of the Persecutions, &c.*, p. 32. Duffy, Dublin. Dr. French was lying ill in a neighbouring town, when Wexford was sacked.

‡ MacGeoghegan’s *Ireland*, Dublin Ed., p. 574. See also Lingard’s *England*, Vol. VIII., Appendix, p. 318, and “ Cromwell in Ireland,” p. 167 ; where the question of the slaughter at the Market cross is discussed. This fiendish barbarism is made the occasion of an unbecoming sneer by a late writer : “ At any rate,” he says, “ the conspicuous absence of the beautiful women of Wexford, both from the invective of the Prelates [at Clonmacnoise] and from all direct contemporary testimony quite justifies us in believing that when Oliver wrote these words [a reply to the prelates], that myth was quite unknown to him.”—“ *Oliver Cromwell: the Man and his Mission.*” By J. Allanson Picton, p. 307. Cassell & Co., London, Paris and New York, 1883. If Cromwell had a Mission, it is a pity Mr. Picton does not tell us what it was, and by whom given. The most distinguished ladies of Drogheda were slaughtered in the crypt of St. Peter’s, and positively we could have never heard of that slaughter, but that there was one Thomas Wood, an officer in Cromwell’s army, who witnessed it, and related it to his friends in England, when he returned home. Nor would that fact have sent it down to us, only that Anthony, his brother, put it into his *Athenæ Oxonienses*. Thus it was preserved by the merest chance. Here is what Cromwell him-

have been specially marked out for extermination. "On the 11th of October, 1649, F. Francis Stafford writes, seven friars of our order, all men of extraordinary merit, and natives of the town, perished by the sword of the heretics. Some of them were killed kneeling before the altar, and others whilst hearing confessions. Father Raymond Stafford, holding a crucifix in his hand, came out of the church to encourage the citizens, and even preached with great zeal to the infuriated enemies themselves, till he was killed by them in the Market Place."*

The slaughter consequent upon the betrayal of Wexford was not confined to the town; it was continued in the suburbs and neighbourhood; for the Puritans assumed they had a mission in Ireland, to kill Catholics wherever they met them; and it cannot be denied that they laboured most zealously in their vocation.† "The Parliament Party," writes Lord Clarendon, "who had heaped so much reproaches and calumnies upon the King for his clemency to the Irish; . . . grounded their own authority and strength upon such foundations as were inconsistent with any toleration of the Roman Catholic religion, and even with any humanity to the Irish nation, and more especially to those of the old native extraction, the whole race whereof they had, upon the matter, sworn to extirpate."‡

Ireton was sent by Cromwell to attack Duncannon fort. In this he failed, owing to a clever piece of strategy on the part of Lord Castlehaven who sent eighty horses with saddles and bridles into the fort by water, in face of the enemy. For those horses the Governor, Captain Wogan, found riders who so alarmed the besiegers by a sally, that they withdrew.§

self writes about the slaughter of Wexford:—"When they were come into the market place [meaning those who were in the town], the enemy making a stiff resistance, our forces brake them, and put all to the sword that came in their way." *Cromwell to Speaker Lenthall, Oct. 14th, 1649.* To use Mr. Picton's own word,—has he any "direct" evidence that women and children did not come in their way? But why make such a wonder of the murder of the women of Wexford? The wonder would be if they had not been so dealt with by men (!) who seemed to take delight in killing women,—especially Irishwomen. When the Puritans won the battle of Naseby, amongst other atrocities related of them, it is recorded, "that one hundred females, some of them ladies of distinguished rank, were put to the sword, under the pretence that they were Irish Catholics."—See Clarendon ii., p. 655, or in some Editions, 659.—Rushworth, vi. 42. Clarendon, *loc. cit.* says, "some were the wives of officers of quality."

* Letter of F. Francis Stafford quoted by Most Rev. Dr. Moran in *Historical Sketch, &c.*, given in full in *Duffy's Magazine*, May, 1847.

† This was carried on under Coote, whom Cromwell left governor of Wexford.

‡ Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in Ireland*, p. 82. Rushworth's *Hist. Coll.* IV., p. 455.

§ It is pleasant to be able to credit Castlehaven with this success, as with great opportunities he did more injury than service to the cause in which he was engaged. It must, however, be borne in mind that it was for his idol, Ormonde, this was done.

It was unfortunate for Ormonde that he had scarcely an officer of distinguished ability to second him, whilst Cromwell had many. He sent Sir Lucas Taaffe, third son of Lord Taaffe, to command in Ross; but, "like sire like son," he delivered up a well fortified town, fully garrisoned, without any real effort to hold it. Cromwell gave him pretty good terms, because he was glad to avoid fighting, having appeared before Ross with a much reduced and discontented army, already heartily tired of their winter campaign. Had Taaffe been equal to the occasion, he could have held the place until relief would come; or at least he could have secured better terms. Here is what Cromwell says on the subject: "The governor desired commissioners might treat, and that in the meantime there might be a ceasing of acts of hostility on both sides. Which I refused; sending in word, that if he would march away with arms, bag and baggage, and give me hostages for performance, he should. Indeed he might have done it without my leave, by the advantage of the river. He insisted upon having the cannon with him; which I would not yield unto, but required the leaving the artillery and ammunition; which he was content to do, and marched away, leaving the great artillery and the ammunition in the stores to me."*

Cromwell on leaving Dublin for his southern campaign, made great proclamation of giving freedom to the people, and of not interfering with their consciences. To ordinary minds this latter promise would be taken to mean the free exercise of religion; but of the meaning attached to it by Cromwell, we have a striking proof in his answer to Taaffe at New Ross. Taaffe asked liberty of conscience for such as would remain in the town after it was given up; to which Cromwell replied:—"As for that which you mention concerning liberty of conscience, I meddle not with any man's conscience. But if by liberty of conscience, you mean a liberty to exercise the Mass, I judge it best to use plain dealing, and to let you know, where the Parliament of England have power, *that* will not be allowed of."† So that Oliver made the vast concession of allowing people to *think* on religious matters as they pleased; as if he could prevent them. Probably he would if he could. No wonder that one of his latest biographers is in ecstasies at his liberality. He says:—"Always let it be remembered that, boastful as this age is of its attainments in freedom of thought and liberty of conscience, even the

* Letter to Lenthal, dated Ross, 25th Oct., 1649. Carlyle, Vol. II., p. 77. Letter CXII.

† Letter to Taaffe, 19th October, 1649. Carlyle, Vol. II., p. 74.

most prominent agitators for such claims in our day, have from Oliver Cromwell much yet to learn.”*

Cromwell's proceedings from his leaving New Ross until he appeared before Clonmel call for no very lengthened notice here. An alarming amount of sickness began to prevail in his army. It was a kind of dysentery arising, it was believed, from the combined influence of food and climate. He himself fell ill at New Ross, where he was obliged to remain for some time to recover and recruit.† His rapid and continuous successes had a great effect on the southern garrisons. The soldiers who held them were Puritans at heart, and Inchiquin's turning over to the King's party wrought no change in their opinions—officers or soldiers. As long as he led them against his former enemies, the Irish Papists, they did not murmur, for they felt they were then at their work, although not under their proper leader. But the peace of '48, by which the Catholics had obtained some privileges, aroused and intensified their old hatred of popery, and they eagerly awaited an opportunity to declare openly for the Parliament.‡ Cromwell's successes made it safe and opportune for them to do so. Inchiquin had the folly to think they were personally devoted to himself as he had commanded them so long, and “possessed with this notion, he could never admit any of the Irish or other troops into his garrisons, which he had stipulated should be left entirely to his own disposal.”§ So that his pet Puritans had a full opportunity of organising their revolt.

Lest the principles of the Puritan soldiers who garrisoned the South should cool down or be forgotten, Cromwell took care to have spies and agents among them, a chief of whom was one Colonel Townshend, who had been cashiered by Inchiquin, because he had been a member of a conspiracy for seizing Youghal and even Inchiquin himself. The latter had merely escaped by getting timely notice of his danger from an officer who remained faithful to him, and who became acquainted with the plot by being solicited to join in it. Townshend thereupon retired to England, and was taken in hand by Cromwell, who shaped him into an accomplished instru-

* Oliver Cromwell : his Life, Times, Battlefields, and Contemporaries. By Paxton Hood, London : 1882. Preface, p. ix. It throws some doubt on Mr. Paxton's fitness for his task, that he did not know the year in which the Irish Rising took place, always making it 1640 instead of 1641.

† The Puritans pretended to think the Catholic Doctors were likely to poison them. “Our condition,” writes one, “for want of physicians is sad, being fain to trust our lives in the Popish doctors' hands, when we fall sick, which is much, if not more than our adventures in the field.”—Letter of W. A., in *Perfect Diurnal*, January 8th, 1650. Quoted in “Cromwell in Ireland,” p. 237.

‡ See p. 337, note.

§ Carte's *Ormonde*, Vol. II., p. 102.

ment for forwarding his design. After some time he returned to Ireland, denouncing the King's murder in the most indignant language; a crime so dreadful, he said, that it caused him to desert the party that was guilty of it, and return to imperil life and limb in the royal cause. The apparent honest earnestness with which he spoke imposed on Inchiquin, who restored him to his former command—the very thing he most desired, in order to be in a position to do Cromwell's work. This he did so effectively, that the southern garrisons revolted from Inchiquin and declared for the Parliament. In the promotion of this defection an important part was also taken by Lord Broghill.* He had been sent on a secret mission to the King some time before Cromwell started on his Irish expedition. Cromwell having discovered this (as he discovered everything), secured an interview with him in London, proved to him that he knew all about his mission, and told him the best thing for him was to turn over to the Parliament. Broghill asked time to consider, but Oliver having caught his bird had no notion to let him fly away, and so told him plainly he must take his advice at once or go to prison. He saw he was caught, gave up his mission to the King, returned to Ireland in October, and applied himself most faithfully in promoting the interests of his new employer.

Cromwell having recovered from his illness, left Ross on the 21st, and arrived before Waterford on the 24th of November. Waterford had many strong defences; and he, with an army sickly and much reduced in numbers, would prefer to win with silver bullets than hazard a siege or an assault. Ormonde was determined to strain every nerve to enable the city to offer a successful resistance; but the state of affairs was very embarrassing to the besieged; they believed there were two enemies at their gates—Cromwell and Ormonde. If they resisted Cromwell and failed, they must be prepared for the fate of Drogheda and Wexford; if they admitted Ormonde, they believed he would hold the place, once relieved, whether they liked it or not; and although not so bloodthirsty as Cromwell, they believed him to be quite as great an enemy to their religion, a fact proved by the whole course of his conduct towards the Catholics, and especially by his persecution of the Nuncio.† He despatched Castlehaven to their aid with one thousand men, but they refused him admission.

* He was son of the fifth Earl of Cork, not third, as is sometimes stated, and brother of Robert Boyle the philosopher, who was the Earl's seventh and youngest son. Lodge's Peerage, Vol. I., pp. 166-7.

† It will be remembered that it was in Waterford, "a noble and Catholic citie," the bishops and clergy assembled on the 6th of August, 1646, to examine the terms of the Peace of '46. See *Unkind Deserter*, Vol. II., p. 44, Dub. ed.

Later, he sent Lieut.-General Ferrall with 1,300, or according to some accounts, 1,500 men. This general, because he was the friend of the Nuncio and Owen Roe's most trusted officer, was received by them, and made military governor of the place. Cromwell, as soon as he had arrived, summoned the garrison to deliver up the city to him on quarter. "Lieutenant-General Ferrall would give way to none to answer other than himself, whose required the trumpeter to returne unto his master with this resulte, that he was Lieutenant-General Ferrall, governor of that place, at present having 2000 of his Ulster forces there, that as long as any of them did survive would not yield the towne; with this intention the trumpeter turned taile; Cromwell hereof certified, dislodginge, turned his aim elsewhere."* Cromwell finding that he would have to encounter an accomplished soldier, brave as he was incorruptible, called a council of war, at which it was resolved to raise the siege and retire into winter quarters. He had lost over a thousand men by sickness during the short time he was before Waterford. Ormonde was at hand with a large force, and could have inflicted great—perhaps irreparable losses on Cromwell's retiring army; but in order to do so, he must pass through the city, a permission which the people peremptorily refused him. Thus a great opportunity to strike a blow for the royal cause was lost. But the Nemesis of Retribution pursued Ormonde through the whole of this campaign—retribution for his hatred and contempt of his Catholic fellow-countrymen, from whom he had sprung; retribution for his insolent behaviour towards the Pope's representative in Ireland, and for the persistent persecution with which he pursued him.

The revolt of the Munster garrisons was a great godsend to Cromwell. It placed at his disposal good winter quarters for his army, and brought a great accession of strength to him. At Whitechurch, near Dungarvan, he was met by 2,500 men of those garrisons, who assured him that winter quarters would be gladly provided for him, in the towns where garrisons had lately declared for the Parliament. He himself fixed his headquarters in Youghal. On his march to this place from Waterford he took Britterstown, Kilmeaden, Curraghmore, Granno, Dunhill and Dungarvan. He arrived before the last-named town on the 4th of December. It had previously submitted to Lord Broghill, but the people having repented of their submission, again shut their gates; terrified at Cromwell's approach, they surrendered at discretion. An order was issued to put the inhabitants to the sword in punishment of their treachery; but Cromwell, from some

* Aphor. Disc., Vol. II., p. 57.

cause or another, changed his mind, revoked the order, spared the lives of the people, and protected the town from plunder with the exception of the church and castle.*

Michael Jones, the Commandant of Dublin and hero of Rathmines, died at Dungarvan. Cromwell writes of him to Lenthal: "The noble Lieutenant-General (Jones) whose finger, to my knowledge, never ached in all these expeditions, fell sick, we doubt not, upon a cold taken upon our late wet march and ill accommodation. He went to Dungarvan, where, struggling for some four or five days with fever, he died; having run his course with so much honor, courage, and fidelity, as his actions speak better than my pen. What England lost hereby, is above me to speak. I am sure I lost a noble friend and companion in labours."† Yet in spite of this panegyric, it is certain that great enmity and distrust existed between Jones and Cromwell. A strict surveillance was maintained by him and Ireton over the movements of Jones, who shortly before his death was engaged in devising projects to beat Cromwell out of Ireland.‡ We are told also that one Mrs. Chaplin, daughter of the Minister of Dungarvan under the Cromwellians, who lived in the house in which Jones died, often said it was confidently believed that Cromwell had found means to poison Jones.§

Ormonde cast about for winter quarters with little success. He himself retired to Kilkenny, but Limerick and Waterford, the two most important places in the hands of the royalists, refused in the most decided manner to admit garrisons from him. Inchiquin went into Kilmallock, against the will of the inhabitants; whilst Hugh O'Neill, with about 1,600 Ulstermen, was joyfully received in Clonmel and its neighbourhood.

* A local tradition says, the lives and property of the people were saved by the following curious incident: As they were about to execute the merciless command, a woman named Nagle forced her way through the crowd with a flagon of beer in her hand, and drank to the General's health, calling on him to pledge her in turn. Cromwell was so pleased with her courage and courtesy, that he accepted the pledge and permitted his soldiers to partake of the liquor, which they, thirsty and heated, found very refreshing, and which the servants of the woman abundantly supplied. The order was immediately revoked. *Cromwell in Ireland*, p. 235. Quoted from *Hall's Ireland*, &c., Vol. I., p. 277. It was not Oliver's custom to revoke his slaughtering orders for trifles; but he may have done it in this case, inasmuch as he must have been in high spirits, after the Munster garrisons having declared for him.

† Letter to Lenthal from Cork, Dec. 19th, 1649.

‡ Morrice's Memoir of Lord Orrery, p. 16.

§ Smith's History of Waterford, p. 65. See *Cromwell in Ireland*, p. 235.

Obs. Cromwell's jealousy and fear of Jones would in a great measure account for his bringing him with him on his Munster campaign. He thus had him under his eye, and had deprived him of the power which possession of Dublin would certainly give him.

At the close of the year 1649, so disastrous to the royal cause, Ormonde applied to the King for permission to leave Ireland; assuring his Majesty, however, that he would not retire from his post without his full approval. The King refused to accede to the request, unless under certain circumstances, which he stated in a letter to Ormonde, and of the existence of which, he, the king, must be made aware, before he would allow him to take his departure.

Although Cromwell had just gone through a rough, trying campaign, he did not remain long inactive at Youghal; but made visits to Cork, Kinsale, Bandon, Skibbereen and some other places which had fallen into his hands by the revolt of Inchiquin's Puritan soldiers. We have the following cotemporary account of the persecutions inflicted on the people of Cork, after the city had fallen into the hands of the Puritans: "Their first edict was, that all the clergy should at once depart from the city; permitting, however, four parish priests to remain, lest the Catholic citizens, who were as yet too powerful, might be impelled to revolt."—"The hatred of the heretics for our religion becoming greater and greater every day, an order was published prohibiting the citizens to carry swords, or to have in their houses any arms whatsoever. This being effected, another proclamation was issued by the President of the Council of War, commanding all Catholics either to abjure their religion or to immediately depart from the city. Should they consent to embrace the parliamentary religion (*parliamentarium religionem*) they were permitted to remain and enjoy their goods and property. Should they, however, pertinaciously adhere to *popery*, all, without exception, were to immediately depart from the city. Three cannon shots were to be fired as signals at stated intervals before nightfall, and any Catholic that should be found in the city after the third signal, was to be massacred without mercy. It was then that the constancy of the citizens in the faith was seen. There was not even one to be found in the whole city to accept the proffered imperious condition, or to seek to enjoy his property and goods with the detriment of his faith. Before the third signal all went forth from the city walls—the men and women, yea, even the children and the infirm; and it was a sight truly worthy of heaven to see so many thousands thus abandoning their homes—so many venerable matrons, with their tender children, wandering through the fields, or overcome by fatigue, seated on the ground, in ditches, or on the highways; so many aged men, some of whom had held high offices in the state, and were members of the nobility, with their wives and families, wandering to and fro, knowing not where to seek a place of refuge; so many merchants

who, on that morning abounded in wealth, but now had not a house in which to rest their weary limbs, yet all with joy went forth to their destruction, abandoning their houses and goods, their revenues and property, and wealth, choosing rather to be afflicted with the people of God, on the mountain tops, and in the caverns, in hunger and thirst, in cold and nakedness, than to enjoy momentary pleasures, and temporal prosperity with sin.”*

Cromwell took the field on the “nine and twentieth of January” (1650), as he tells us, to begin his Spring campaign. The army was in good health, and although not so numerous as when he landed in Ireland, was greatly augmented by the soldiers of the revolted garrisons. They had abundant supplies from England, and they were full of confidence from their recent series of victories. He turned his face towards Kilkenny; took Fethard, Callan, Cahir, and many smaller places that fell in his way; in short, he seemed to be making a triumphant progress, instead of carrying on a campaign. Ormonde had wintered in Kilkenny, which, however, he quitted when Cromwell’s approach made it insecure for him, and retired to Limerick, leaving Castlehaven in command. The Commissioners of Trust proceeded to Ennis. Colonel Hewson, whom Cromwell had left governor of Dublin when he went south, received orders to join him with as many troops as he could safely spare from Dublin and other garrisons. He left Dublin on the 24th of February with 2,000 foot and 1,000 horse. He took the strong castle of Ballysonan, near Kilcullen, and some other places as he proceeded, and thus kept his communication with Dublin open. Meantime Castlehaven was ordered by Ormonde to take the field. Having done so, he stormed Athy with success, where a magazine and 700 prisoners fell into his hands.

Cromwell having been joined at Gowran by Hewson, appeared before Kilkenny with a strong force; but that did not prevent him from having recourse to his old “silver bullet” practice; so he bribed an officer of the garrison named Tickle, who undertook to give him information as to where the defences were weakest, and to open some of the gates to him when he came before the

* *Relatio rerum quarumdarum, &c.* Anno 1650, Spic. Ossor., Vol. II., p. 52. Translated in *Historical Sketch, &c.*, compiled by Most Rev. Dr. Moran, pp. 40-1. Duffy, Dublin. *Obs.*—Colonel Phaire (or Phayr), was governor of Cork at this time. Having been a leading man in the revolt of the garrison against Inchiquin, he was appointed by Cromwell to the post. It would appear that the persecution above related was either suggested or approved of by Cromwell. Writing to Lenthal he says:—“The Garland, one of your third-rate ships, coming happily into Waterford Bay, I ordered her, and a great prize lately taken in that bay, to transport Colonel Phayr to Cork. . . . Giving him such instructions as were proper for the promoting of your interests there.” Letter of 14th Nov., 1649. *Aphor. Disc.*, Vol. III., p. 319.

city. Tickle's treachery fared badly with him. Letters of his were intercepted, revealing the plot. He confessed the whole business, and so was hanged.* It was generally believed that Kilkenny could have held out much longer than it did, but Sir Walter Butler seeing the townspeople inclined, or rather resolved to come to terms with Cromwell, thought it better to make conditions before they did so, and before the besiegers became exasperated against the city.

Kilkenny was surrendered on articles drawn up on the 27th of March, 1650. By the first of these the city and castle were delivered up to Cromwell, "with all arms, ammunition, and provision of public stores therein." The 2nd article was, "That all the inhabitants of the said city of Kilkenny, and all others therein, shall be defended in their persons, goods, and estates, from the violence of the soldiery, and that such as shall desire to remove thence elsewhere, none excepted, shall have liberty so to do, with their goods, within three months after the date of these articles." 3. The third article provided that the governors, officers, and soldiers, "and all others who shall be so pleased," shall march away, at or before nine o'clock to-morrow morning (the 28th) "bag and baggage." The soldiers were to march two miles from the city, with drums beating, colours flying, matches lighting, ammunition in pouches, and then and there deliver up their arms, &c., except one hundred stand, which they were allowed to retain to protect themselves from the Tories.†

"Catholicity was flourishing in the city of Kilkenny, when the Puritan army, like a devastating torrent, overturning everything in its course, appeared before the walls. As soon as they got possession of the city, they impiously profaned the churches, overthrew the altars, destroyed the paintings and crosses, and showed their contempt for everything sacred. The vestments, which had been for the most part concealed, were discovered and plundered by the soldiery. The books and paintings were cast into the streets,

* The bribe which Tickle was to receive seems an exceptionally large one, namely £4,000, the governorship of Kilkenny, and a high command in Cromwell's army. See Billings' *Vindiciæ Cathol.*, &c., pp. 226-7, and "Cromwell in Ireland," p. 294.

† The people called Tories robbed, but they must not be regarded as common robbers. In the beginning, they were the owners or descendants of the owners of Irish estates, who had been robbed themselves, in the various confiscations under Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I. They did not consider it a crime to make predatory raids on the new possessors of the lands, which they still looked upon as their own. They took shelter in the woods, had their leaders, and received recruits. The system became enlarged by degrees, and many who could not claim to be the descendants of former owners became Tories; but the representative of some old proprietor was usually their Colonel or Captain. Those Tories were, in the eye of the law, outlaws and rebels, and a price was

and either burned or taken away as booty. Dr. Patrick Lynch of Galway writing on the 1st of May, 1650, to the Secretary of the Congregation of the Propaganda, says that a report had reached him of cruelties that had taken place in the city of Kilkenny, and of a number of priests, religious, nobles, and merchants who had been put to death there."* A very beautiful stone structure built in the style of an obelisk stood in the High Street at this time. It was surmounted by a sculptured representation of the Crucifixion. Cromwell's soldiers, after having got possession of the city, made a target of this sacred symbol, and did not cease firing at it until it was destroyed. We are told by two contemporary and independent authorities, that of seven soldiers who were most prominent in this unholy work, six died of some mysterious disease within the two following days.† Dr. Griffith Williams, Protestant bishop of Kilkenny, then in exile, thus laments the disasters that had befallen the Cathedral of St. Canice: "The great and most famous and most beautiful Cathedral Church of St. Keney, they have utterly defaced and ruined. They have thrown down the great roof of it, taken away five great and goodly bells, broken down all the windows, and carried away every bit of glass, which, they say, was worth a very great deal; and all the doors of it, that hogs might come and root, and the dogs gnaw the bones of the dead; and they broke down a most exquisite marble font, wherein the Christians' children were regenerated, all to pieces, and threw down many goodly marble monuments that were therein, and especially that stately and costly monument of the most honourable and noble family of the House of Ormonde, and divers others of most rare and excellent work, not much inferior,

generally set on the heads of the leaders. It was a service very acceptable to the State, to shoot them down wherever met with.

J. P. Prendergast thus writes of them:—"These Tories or outlaws will be found to have had their origin in the extraordinary revolutions which landed property in Ireland underwent in Queen Elizabeth's, James the First's, Charles the First's, Cromwell's, and Charles the Second's reigns—nothing in the History of Europe being similar to the Cromwellian Settlement except the conquests effected by the northern barbarians; so that, had Augustin Thierry only known it, he need not have selected the Conquest of England by the Normans on the grounds of its being the latest of those conquests where men, deprived of all that makes life valuable, are seen resigning themselves to the sight of strangers sitting as masters at their own hearths, or frantic with despair, rushing to the forest to live there like wolves, in rapine, murder, and independence."¹

* Cromwell in Ireland, pp. 313-14, and authorities there quoted.

† Ibid., p. 315.

¹ The Tory War of Ulster. By John P. Prendergast, author of the "Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland," part I., p. 6.

if I be not mistaken, to most of the best, excepting the Kings', that are in St. Paul's Church, or the Abbey of Westminster."*

"When Kilkenny was captured by the Puritans under Cromwell, in 1650, the Catholic priests were either hanged or driven into exile. The Archbishop of Dublin, in a letter to the Propaganda, dated June 6th, 1650, said, that Dr. Rothe in the beginning of March, when endeavouring to escape, was dragged from his carriage, stripped of his clothes, and then covered with an old cloak which was full of vermin, and cast into a filthy dungeon, where he died the next month. From a letter of the bishop of Clonfert, it would appear that the aged bishop, after being treated in so brutal a manner by his captors, was suffered to die in his own house."†

It was thus that Cromwell and his Puritans observed the 2nd article of the agreement by which Kilkenny was surrendered to him.

Cromwell was such a power in himself, that he required but little aid from others during his "root and branch" campaign in Ireland; yet he had many efficient helpers. Broghill, Ireton and Ludlow were in no way inferior to him for zeal in exterminating the Irish, but although they hated those Irish and their religion just as much as he did, only one out of the three (his-son-in-law Ireton) had the least regard for him. Broghill was a trimmer, and had but lately deserted the Royal cause. Ludlow actually hated Cromwell, a fact which he does not attempt to conceal in his Memoirs; he rather gives it prominence.

Lord Broghill, in conjunction with Henry Cromwell, who had just landed at Youghal, defeated Inchiquin near Limerick, and was proceeding to join the main army before Clonmel, when he received secret intelligence from his brother that David, Lord Roche, was collecting forces for the relief of that town. Broghill at once rode off to Clonmel, whence he received reinforcements amounting to nearly two thousand men, horse and foot. With these he returned and uniting them with his own forces went in search of Roche. He found him at Macroom; and being reinforced and unexpected he dealt him a crushing defeat, killing, it was said, about 700 of his men, and taking many prisoners. Among the latter were the Bishop of Ross, Boetius

* Ibid., p. 317. The monument above referred to was that of Thomas Butler, surnamed the Black. He was tenth Earl of Ormonde, and died in 1614. *Obs.*—He was familiarly known as "Black Tom," and was a great favourite with Queen Elizabeth, who sometimes playfully called him her "black husband."

† Episcopal Succession. By W. Maziere Brady. Vol. I., p. 365. The celebrated David Rothe was Bishop of Osmory from 1618 till his death in 1650.

Egan, and the High Sheriff of Kerry.* Broghill ordered the High Sheriff to be shot, but the bishop was spared with the object of utilizing his influence to induce the garrison of a neighbouring castle, Carrigadrohid, to give it up. Broghill ordered the bishop to be brought before the place, and "offered him pardon if he would use his efforts to make the garrison surrender. When he was brought within hearing of those within, instead of urging them to yield, he exhorted them to maintain their post resolutely against the enemies of their religion and country. A true soldier could have honoured such heroism, even in an enemy. But not so Broghill; by his order the brave bishop was abandoned to the fury of the soldiers. His arms were first severed from his body; he was then dragged along the ground to a tree close by, and hanged from one of its branches with the reins of his own horse."†

The hardest piece of work which Cromwell had to face in Ireland, was still before him—the siege of Clonmel. The town was important by population and position; important too, on this occasion from another cause; it was held by Hugh O'Neill, Owen Roe's nephew, at the head of 1200 or 1500 of his fearless and

* De Burgo says the bishop was seized on the highway. "*In via publica a Turma Equitum hostilium comprehensus.*" Hib. Dominicana, p. 490.

† Cromwell in Ireland, pp. 322-3, and authorities quoted. "The bishop," says Taylor, "having pledged his word to return, went to the fort, and, assembling the soldiers, earnestly conjured them to be faithful to their King, their country, and their God;—he then returned to Broghill, and was immediately hanged. This instance of pure fidelity and devoted heroism is described as the extreme of insolence and obstinacy, by those who could discover no merit in an Irishman and a Papist."—*Civil Wars*, Vol. II., p. 39.

"His enemies could discover nothing in this conduct but insolence and obstinacy, for he was a papist and a prelate."—*Leland's Ireland*, Vol. III., p. 363.

The holy Bishop, Boetius Egan, was a native of Duhallow in the County of Cork. He was sent in early youth to Louvain to prosecute his studies, where he took the habit of the Franciscan Order. He had for cotemporaries there, Colgan, Fleming, and others, who afterwards became famous in the annals of Irish Literature. He had returned to Ireland before the Rising of 1641. He was Chaplain-General to the Irish Forces at Benburb. On the eve of this famous battle "the whole army confessed, and Owen O'Neill, with the other generals, piously partook of the Holy Sacrament; the testimonials of their confession were given by the hands of O'Neill to one of the Generals of the Observantines deputed by the Nuncio to the spiritual care of the army, who, after a short exhortation, pronounced the Apostolic Benediction, and instantly calling on the name of his Holiness, they rushed to the conflict." Father Egan is here called an Observantine, because he belonged to the Franciscans of the Strict Observance. On the 11th of August, 1646, the Nuncio recommended Father Egan to Rome for the See of Ross, for which he received the papal brief "in or before April, 1648." He was consecrated by the Nuncio himself. *Franciscan Monasteries*, p. 237. By Rev. C. P. Meehan, M.R.I.A. Cromwell in Ireland, by Rev. D. Murphy, S.J., p. 326. *The Embassy in Ireland*, p. 173. *Brady's Episcopal Succession*, Vol. II., p. 112, &c.

devoted Ulstermen. The inhabitants were thoroughly loyal to their King, their religion and country. Unlike the bloodthirsty enemy who was at their gates, they acted with praiseworthy liberality to those who differed from them in religion, giving all the Protestants who did not wish to join them, a safe conduct to retire from the town; and it is a remarkable fact that the Commissioners who afterwards inquired into the Irish massacres found that there had been no murder committed in the vicinity of Clonmel. Cromwell appeared before the place on the 27th of April, 1650; but about a month before he had sent some regiments to block the approaches. The garrison was resolute, and O'Neill and the Mayor solemnly bound themselves to defend the place to the last; so that, although Cromwell offered fair terms if the garrison would surrender, O'Neill's reply was a decided refusal. Thus things at once came to the arbitrament of the sword.

As soon as Cromwell's cannon were got into position, he opened fire on the defences. The besieged replied by many well planned sallies inflicting severe losses on the besiegers, "who," says the Aphorismical Author, "some days lost 200, other days 300, other 400, and other 500 men." This seems an exaggeration, but anyhow, Cromwell's losses were so great that he would have gladly retired from the place, if he could have done so without injuring his reputation. But feeling that he could not, he had recourse to his usual weapon—bribery. He, by those secret practices of which he was so great a master, discovered a fit instrument for his purpose; this was Major Fennell, who was commander of the horse under O'Neill. He was the nephew of that Dr. Fennell who was physician to the Ormonde family, and whom Ormonde managed to have placed on the Supreme Council of the Confederation, to act as his spy and tool. Captain Fennell, now in high command, seems to have been a traitor all through; and having, no doubt, imbibed the principles of his uncle the doctor, and of his master, Ormonde, he behaved like one who thought that every reverse suffered by the Catholic army was a clear gain to the Marquis. Captain Fennell had been at the battle of Portlester serving under Castlehaven, and there, with a strong force at his command, he remained suspiciously inactive, whilst some of O'Neill's kinsmen were cut to pieces before his face. He surrendered Cappoquin, a strong place, without striking a blow. He abandoned the pass at Killaloe, and thus allowed Ireton to cross the Shannon, and invest Limerick at the Clare side; and during the siege of that city he conspired with some other officers, seized one of the gates, and threatened to admit the enemy, unless the garrison capitulated. He should

have been executed long before for his persistent treachery, but it remained for the enemy, whom that treachery had so much served, to give him his due. Ireton hanged him after taking Limerick.

"Tempted by an offer of £500 and of full pardon for the crime of taking up arms against the Parliament, Fennell promised to open one of the gates on the north side of the town the next night, at 12 o'clock, and to allow five hundred of the besieging force to enter by it. A party of Ulstermen were on guard there. These he drew off, and in their place he put some men of his own regiment, as he knew they would not offer such a stubborn resistance as the brave men of the north. It so happened that, on the same night, Hugh O'Neill went to visit the posts and see with his own eyes how they were kept. He was told that Fennell was more busy than usual. When he reached the gate he found it guarded by Fennell's men only, though he had given the strictest orders shortly before, that two-thirds at least of the number of those who watched the gates should be Ulstermen. Suspecting that treachery was at work, he called for the officer in command, and having questioned him and found his answers unsatisfactory, he had him taken into custody. Fennell could not conceal his guilt; he promised to reveal the conspiracy in all its details, on condition that he should receive full pardon of his crime. As soon as O'Neill was made aware of the plot, he secured the various posts by means of strong reinforcements. In addition to the ordinary guard he placed a body of five hundred men at the gate by which the enemy would be admitted. All this was done so noiselessly that no suspicion was excited of the discovery just made. Advising with the rest what was best to do in that extremity, they resolved to open the gate, according to the former covenant. The enemy was watching his opportunity, and observing the signal, marched towards the gate; five hundred did enter, the rest, *nolens volens*, were kept out; all that entered were put to the sword."*

Cromwell, provoked and disappointed by his ill success at Clonmel, sent the most pressing orders to Lord Broghill to hasten to his aid. That active commander was fortunate enough to be free to join Cromwell, for the message reached him after he had defeated Lord Roche. With his usual rapidity he marched to Clonmel. His arrival put new courage into the

* Aphor. Discovery, Vol. II., p. 78. Cromwell in Ireland, p. 330. "This treachery was now grown universal, arising sometimes from the fears of the inhabitants, and sometimes from the corruption, avarice or cowardice of the garrisons of the towns; and was the cause of the loss of Kilmallock, and the Castle of Catherlogh, and of almost all the strong places in Leinster and Munster that were taken this year." Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 114.

hearts of the downeast besiegers, who began to carry on their work with renewed vigour. A breach having been made, the storm commenced, but the storming party seem to have been in complete ignorance of the preparations O'Neill had made to receive them.

O'Neill, says a cotemporary author, "did set all men and maids to work, townsmen and soldiers (only those on duty attending the breach and the walls) to draw dunghills, mortar, stones, and timber, and make a long lane a man's height and about eighty yards length, on both sides up from the breach, with a footbank at the foot of it;* and he caused to be placed engines on both sides of the lane, and two guns at the end of it invisible, opposite to the breach, and so ordered all things against a storm." He entrusted the defence of this to a body of volunteers, armed with swords, scythes, and pikes. In the adjoining houses he placed a picked body of musketeers, and ordered them to keep up a steady fire on all approaching the breach. The storm began about eight o'clock in the morning. "The Puritans advanced to the assault, singing one of their scripture hymns. They entered without any opposition, and but few were to be seen in the town, till they so entered that the lane was crammed full with horsemen, armed, with helmets, backs, breasts, swords, musquetoons, and pistols, on which those in front seeing themselves in a pound, and could not make their way further, cried out, 'Halt!' 'Halt!' On which those entering behind at the breach, thought by those words that all

* The Author of the *Aphor. Disc.* [Vol. II., p. 78], says O'Neill "caused a counter-scarp to be made with a huge ditche right opposite to the breach." No doubt, he did. Otherwise there would have been no "pound." Had he not done so, the very pressure of the numbers in the lane would have enabled, or rather compelled the besiegers in front to force their way into the town. Thus then the pound was formed:—two walls about eighty yards long were built from the breach towards the town; between them was a lane passage, at least as wide as the breach; at the town end of this lane was constructed the counter-scarp, with the great ditch in front of it, and the footbank behind it, where the escarp usually is, but the footbank suited O'Neill's strategy better, for on it, he planted the two guns, masked of course, which raked that lane with such a murderous fire. When the right moment came O'Neill's "resolute party" flew to the breach and flung back the besiegers, allowing no more to enter. The Pound was complete: two walls with a lane between them; the breach blocked by O'Neill's men; the counter-scarp and great ditch at the opposite end. And, says the *Aphorismical* author, the "besiegers advancinge forwardes unawares (both opposition and assault beinge so furious and hot) not obsearvinge either ditche or counter-scarp, fell head longe unto the said ditche from whence was noe redemption or possibility of recoverie, but there were massacred and butcherd. Their seconds and comrades seeinge what hapned, retired, neither the threats of the Generall, nor the bloudie swords of inferiour officers was sufficient enough to keepe them from turning tayle to the assaulte, and turned to the camp, leaving Major-General O'Neyle in the possession of a bloudie wall."—*Ibid.* VII., p. 78.

those of the garrison were running away, and cried out, 'Advance!' 'Advance!' as fast as those before cried 'Halt!' 'Halt!' and so advanced till they thrust forward those before them, till that pound or lane was full and could hold no more. Then suddenly rushes a resolute party of pikes and musqueteers to the breach, and scoured off, and knocked back those entering. At which instance Hugh Duff's men within fell on those in the pound with shots, pikes, scythes, stones and casting of great long pieces of timber with the engines amongst them; and then two guns firing at them from the end of the pound, slaughtering them by the middle or knees with chained bullets, that in less than an hour's time a thousand men were killed in that pound, being a top one another. About this time Cromwell was on horseback at the gates with his guard, expecting the gates to be opened by those entered, until he saw those in the breach beaten back and heard the cannons going off within. Then he fell off, as much vexed as ever he was since he first put on a helmet against the King, for such a repulse he did not usually meet with."*

"So great was the slaughter that the infantry refused to advance the second time. Cromwell appealed to the cavalry. Amongst the first who responded to his call was Lieutenant Charles Langley. He was followed by Colonel Sankey, and one of the sons of John Cooke, whose services in pleading against Charles I. had been rewarded with the Chief-Justiceship of Munster. The troopers imitated the conduct of their officers, and in this way a second storming party was formed, under the command of Colonel Culin. Langley put himself at the head of the dismounted cavalry. Sankey seems to have directed the assault. Cromwell's soldiers displayed an energy and bravery worthy of their former fame. Their onset was so fierce that the Irish were driven from the breach, [which, as stated above, they had seized to prevent the besiegers from continuing to enter]. The assailants made their way to the eastern breastwork [counter scarp], opposite the breach; but they were exposed to the galling cross fire from the neighbouring houses. Colonel Culin and several of his officers fell. Langley strove to mount the wall. His left hand was cut off by a blow of a scythe.† Determined at all hazards to gain the place, Cromwell continued to pour masses of troops into the breach, the hinder ranks pushing on those before them. For four hours the slaughter continued. By that time the greater part of the assailants were

* The War of Ireland. By a British officer of Sir John Clottworthy's Regiment, p. 107.

† Hall's Ireland, Vol. II., p. 90. Taylor's Civil Wars, Vol. II., p. 38.

killed or wounded.”* A retreat was sounded, and the remnant of the besiegers that had survived retired to their camp, leaving O'Neill in full possession of the breach.†

But O'Neill could resist no longer. His provision and ammunition were exhausted. He held a council of his officers, and the decision come to was, that they should retire from the town, but to do so with safety and success presented no ordinary difficulties. O'Neill was equal to the emergency. He resolved to draw off his forces with all secrecy under cover of the night, and leave the mayor to make the best terms he could with Cromwell. He acquainted the mayor with this resolve, and it was agreed between them that when the mayor judged O'Neill to be six or seven miles away from the town, that he should send privately to Cromwell for leave to speak to him about conditions of surrender, but to make no mention of O'Neill, until the conditions were arranged and ratified. Having settled matters thus with the mayor, O'Neill managed to cross the river undiscovered by the guard of horse that lay at the other side of the bridge, and marched almost continuously until he reached a town called Ballnasack, twelve miles from Clonmel, where he refreshed his men.

He then proceeded to Waterford, but was not allowed to enter the city, as we learn from the author of the *Aphorismical Discovery*. “Major General Neylle,” he writes, “arrivinge into Waterford, was not permitted to enter the city for severall motives: the one, that Preston was not so kind or loyall-hearted that he would willingly entertain the warrior, the other, that the cittie was thought too narrow for both parties, and allsoe that the plague was within the towne. By these and such other surmises the major and his party was kept out, and must continue as centinnells or safeguard between the enemy and cittie, neither town nor Governor Thomas Preston allowinge them any means or provision, other than what they could have from the countrie, having such a stronge enemy at their nose, until Diego Preston, condoling their case, did share with them one moytie of the garrison soldiers' meanes and provision, 18d. price, and some ammunition breade, per week; whereby mighty relieved, sure the enemie would choose any other to be his neighbour rather than Hugh Oneylle, as havinge by woful experience a sadd trial of his courage and deportment everie day with some bickeringe.” The plague was thinning O'Neill's ranks, and the enemy was creeping in upon him; so he dismissed his foot, telling them to

* Cromwell in Ireland, pp. 335-6.

† See Appendix A., for the Story of the SILVER BULLET.

"betake themselves by the shortest cutt to Limerick." He and Major Fennell with the few horse he had, rode in the same direction during the night. The enemy having notice of O'Neill's flight pursued him about 30 miles towards Kilmallock, but he reached Limerick in safety.*

"The mayor, according as he was advised, about twelve o'clock at night, sent out to Cromwell very privately for a conduct to wait upon his Excellency; which forthwith was sent to him, and an officer to conduct him from the wall to Cromwell's tent, who, after some course of compliments, was not long capitulating, when he got good conditions for the town, such in a manner as they desired. After which Cromwell asked him if Hugh O'Neill knew of his coming out, to which he answered he did not, for that he was gone two hours after night fell with all his men, at which Cromwell stared and frowned at him, and said, 'You knave, have you served me so, and did not tell me so before?' To which the mayor replied, if his Excellency had demanded the question, he would tell him. Then he asked him what that Duff O'Neill was, to which the Mayor answered, that he was an over sea soldier, born in Spain; on which Cromwell said, 'G——d——n you and your over sea!' and desired the mayor to give the paper again. To which the other answered, that he hoped his Excellency would not break his conditions or take them from him, which was not the repute his Excellency had, but to perform whatsoever he had promised. On which Cromwell was somewhat calm, but said in a fury, 'By G—— above he would follow that Hugh Duff O'Neill wheresoever he went.'"+

"Then the mayor delivered the keys of the gates to Cromwell, who immediately commanded guards on them, and next morning himself entered, where he saw his men killed in the pound, notwithstanding which, and his fury that Hugh Duff went off as he did, he kept his conditions with the town." "This relation I had not only from some officers and soldiers of the besiegers, but also from the besieged, and that certainly Cromwell lost at the siege and storm about fifteen hundred men, being more than he lost by all the towns he stormed."‡

Cromwell has got a good deal of credit for keeping his conditions with the Mayor of Clonmel, as he had made them in

* Aphor. Discovery, Vol. II., pp. 79-80. Waterford was surrendered to the parliament forces on the 6th of August [1650]. Diary of a Parliamentary Officer in Aphor. Disc., Vol. III., p. 219.

† The War of Ireland, &c., p. 107, *et seq.*

‡ The War of Ireland. By a British officer, &c., p. 107, *et seq.* Carte gives Cromwell's loss before Clonmel at 2,000. The Relation, &c., says more than 2,000; McGeoghegan and Borlase, 2,500.

ignorance of O'Neill's flight. This he did despite some of his officers, who maintained that the secret retirement of O'Neill was a breach of the articles, and that he was not bound by them. Cromwell refused to listen to these suggestions; there were other important considerations influencing his mind at the moment. The summons he had received to return to England was for sometime in his hands, and was of the most urgent kind: the interests of the Commonwealth required his immediate presence there, and, what he doubtless thought quite as important, his own interests required it; for if the command he was called back to assume, had to be conferred on another, his whole plans for the future would be put out of joint—perhaps irretrievably marred. Besides O'Neill's retirement from the town might be a piece of strategy which Oliver could not immediately fathom. That general had beaten him at strategy from the beginning, and if he overreached him by this last move, he would be a ruined man. His forces were greatly weakened and dispirited. His adhesion to his terms with the Mayor was a safe and defensible course, which would enable him to appear in England as the hero of a brilliant campaign, closing with the surrender of the important town of Clonmel. Oliver was too shrewd not to see that further effort on his part would be full of peril, even if such effort could be made; for "he doubted of getting on the soldiers next day to a fresh assault, and it was with much entreaty he persuaded them to lodge that night under the walls, that their siege might be believed not absolutely to be quitted."* Cromwell, in short, was but too glad of any fair excuse for quitting a place which, as he said, had well nigh "brought his nobles to nine pence."†

* Cary's Memorials, quoted in Cromwell in Ireland, p. 340.

† The correct form of the above pithy and favourite saying gives "noble" in the singular:—*e. g.* Had well nigh "brought his *noble* to nine pence." The saying arose from the name of a gold piece first struck in the reign of Edward III., of the value of 6s. 8d. It was called a "noble" either on account of its value, its beauty, or purity, or on account of all three. It was the largest and finest coin then known. It was struck to take the place of gold florins, which, through avarice, were too much alloyed by Edward, and had to be withdrawn from circulation. Some, with less probability, say it was called a "noble" in honour of a great naval victory gained over the French, at which Edward commanded in person. The noble continued to be a principal coin of the realm long after Edward's time; for we find it current during the reigns of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. The coinage in the reign of the former monarch became so depreciated, that his successors were compelled to reduce his shilling, first, to ninepence, then, to sixpence, and finally to withdraw it altogether from circulation. It is more than probable that during this period of alarming depreciation people began to say, "the noble itself [their best coin], would be brought to ninepence at last." The *double entendre*—noble, a coin, and noble, belonging to the nobility—together with the alliteration, was attractive. And thus, we may

Cromwell's articles with the Mayor of Clonmel are dated May 18th, 1650,* and he sailed from Youghal for England on the 29th of the same month; not, however, before he tried a flying shot at Waterford, in the hope, according to the Aphorismical Author, "to recover there what by Hugh O'Neill, he had lost at Clonmel;" but he had scarcely come before the town when he received commands from England to appear there at sight.† Oliver, doubtless, would wish to recover what he lost before Clonmel. But he had, in all likelihood, two other motives for trying a dash at Waterford:—(1), a hope of retrieving his previous want of success there, and (2) an anxious desire to get hold of O'Neill, who had retired to that city from Clonmel. Did he not swear roundly to the Mayor of Clonmel, that "he would follow that Hugh Duff O'Neill wheresoever he went?" But there was no time either to take Waterford or catch O'Neill. He placed Ireton in command, who was already president of Munster, and hastened to Youghal.

By the terms of Surrender the inhabitants of Clonmel were to be protected "in their lives and estates from all plunder and violence of the soldiery, and to have the same right, liberty, and protection as other subjects." There is no certain evidence that those terms were substantially violated, but the soldiers becoming indignant on finding that O'Neill had escaped, followed his line of march, and cut off all stragglers they overtook, amongst whom were two hundred women and children.‡ De Burgo records the martyrdom of priests after the taking of Clonmel and during the siege. Father James O'Reilly, a learned theologian and eloquent preacher, who taught polite literature and the Christian doctrine in that town, endeavoured to escape after O'Neill had retired, but fell into the hands of some Cromwellian soldiers. He at once proclaimed his quality and made profession of his faith before them.§ Instead of killing him at once, they covered his whole body with wounds. He lived about an hour, continuing to the last to invoke the Sacred Name, and to im-

suppose, sprang into existence a saying which, although very old, is by no means obsolete to-day. See Wade's *British History, Chronologically Arranged; Reigns of Edward III. and Henry VIII.* The long connection of the "noble" with legal business appears from the following passage:—"Upon every writ procured for debt or damage, amounting to forty pounds or more, a *noble*, that is six shillings and eightpence, is, and usually hath been paid to fine."—*Bacon*.

* Carte's *Ormonde*, Vol II., p. 115.

† Vol. II., p. 79.

‡ Letter in "*Cromwell in Ireland*," p. 340.

§ "Sacerdos sum," said the brave Dominican, "et religiosus, licit indignus." *Hib. Dominicana*, p. 566.

plore the intercession of the Holy Mother of God and his patron saints. Father Myler Magrath, who went to Clonmel to afford the consolations of religion to the wounded and dying, was seized in the very act of exercising his ministry, and immediately hanged.* During the siege, F. Nicholas Mulcahy, Parish Priest of Ardfinnan, in the Co. Tipperary, was taken by a reconnoitering party of Cromwell's troopers. They offered him his life if he would advise the besieged to surrender, but this he firmly refused to do; he was led out in view of the town, and there beheaded as he knelt praying for his faithful people and the forgiveness of his enemies.†

On his arrival in England Cromwell received a great ovation. He was met at Hounslow Heath by Fairfax and the officers of the army. Many members of Parliament also went to greet him. He was, with "great ceremonies and appearances of joy," conducted to Whitehall, where a dignified residence called the Cockpit had been allotted to him by Parliament. Cromwell's presence in England was made necessary by the menacing attitude of Scotland towards the Commonwealth. The young "King of Scots," as the English called Charles the II., had made terms with his people, and was daily expected to land in Scotland. Commissioners had been sent to him at Bredain, in March, 1650. He yielded to all their demands, and promised to take the Covenant on his arrival in Scotland, and to uphold it. The Scotch army moved southwards, but did not cross the Border. The Commonwealth bestirred itself and made preparations to meet the Scotch. Fairfax was commander-in-chief of the army of the Commonwealth, and Cromwell was to be made second in command under him in the coming campaign. Fairfax, however, declined to be the commander of an army, whose declared object was the invasion of Scotland, as he held that there was no justification for such a step, since the Scots had not invaded England. Had they done so, he would, he said, be quite ready, to lead an army against them, but as they had not, his conscience told him he should not invade their country. Fairfax was a chivalrous, high-minded man, and had, besides, tendencies towards Presbyterianism; his wife was a strict Presbyterian, and counselled him to retire into private life rather than invade Scotland without just cause. Moreover, he was not such a

* Post expletum *Missæ Sacrificium, et administrandum moribundo homini Sacrosanctum Eucharistiæ Sacramentum, Pixide Sacrá in manibus reperta captus*, &c. *Ibid.*, p. 56.

† Moran, from Bruodin. See O'Reilly's *Sufferers for the Faith in Ireland*, p. 230.

fanatical enemy of monarchy as many others of his time. And finally Cromwell was a most inconvenient man to act with; for whilst professing the greatest submission to those above him, he was continually intriguing against them, in order to discredit them, set them aside, and clear his own path upwards. Of this Fairfax had experience enough, and he did not care to be subject to his second in command. Oliver, who always became personally inspired, when it served his purpose, had no scruples about invading Scotland. In this as in many other cases he could draw abundant justification from the 110th psalm, and could put to silence all objectors by his ever ready and infallible defence—"God would have it so;" which being interpreted, meant that, "he, Oliver, would have it so."

Fairfax retired into private life on a pension of £5,000 a year. Cromwell led the English army into Scotland, won the great battle of Dunbar against superior numbers, and the disadvantage of ground, and by the crowning victory of Worcester sent the young King on those wonderful adventures of his, which, as related by Clarendon, surpass the most highly wrought romances.*

It may be convenient here to say a few words about the movements of the Ulster army after Owen Roe's death. That General arranged, during his last illness, that in case he did not recover, his successor in the command should be chosen by the nobility and gentry of the province. The choice was to be ratified by the Marquis of Ormonde, with whom he had come to terms during his illness. Those who had authority to vote for the future general met in Belturbet for that purpose on the 18th of March, 1650. Many candidates presented themselves, and there was much dissension among the electors. The O'Neill party thought the General of the Ulster army should be an O'Neill, whilst they differed as to what particular O'Neill should be chosen. Ormonde, who was greatly interested in the appointment, put forward Daniel O'Neill, a nephew of Owen's, who always acted with Ormonde, was frequently the medium of intercourse between himself and Owen Roe, and was, moreover, a Protestant; but Daniel O'Neill felt that the Catholic army, as

* LADY FAIRFAX.—On the first day of Charles the First's trial, when the name of Fairfax was called, as one of the commissioners, a female voice cried from the gallery, "He has more wit than to be here." On another occasion, when Bradshaw attributed the charge against the King to the consentient voice of the people of England, the same female voice exclaimed, "No, not one-tenth of the people." A faint murmur of approbation followed, but was instantly suppressed by the military. The speaker was recognised to be Lady Fairfax, wife of the commander-in-chief; and these affronts, probably on that account, were suffered to pass unnoticed. *Nation's Trial*.—Clarendon, iii., p. 254. *Lingard*, viii., p. 115.

the Ulster army was called, would not accept a Protestant general, so he declined to offer himself for the post and with a correct and apparently unbiased judgment, recommended Hugh Duff O'Neill, another nephew, then actively engaged in his famous defence of Clonmel, "as being a man who knew the ways Owen Roe O'Neill took to manage the people, and one not unacceptable to the Scots, and who would do nothing contrary to Ormonde's command."* Unfortunately, private interests appeared to influence both candidates and electors more than the good of their country. A man who had no private ends to serve would have had no difficulty in fixing on Lieutenant-General O'Ferrall, Owen Roe's most trusted officer, or on Hugh Duff O'Neill, his major-general and nephew, named above; but because the latter did not appear at Belturbet (which they knew was out of his power to do), he was passed over, as if he could not be elected in his absence!

Heber M'Mahon, Bishop of Clogher, was one of the candidates; to secure something like unanimity he was chosen General-in-chief of Ulster. It is said by his cotemporaries that he was a man of much good sense and political sagacity, but of course he was not in any sense a soldier, except that he was by no means wanting in courage. It was an unnatural combination, that of mitre and crozier with sword and helmet, but it had to be accepted as the best arrangement under the circumstances. Recruits flocked to the bishop's standard, and he soon found himself at the head of about 6,000 men, horse and foot. He gained some trifling successes at first, but by an ill-considered movement he allowed Coote and Venables to unite their forces, and thus become too strong for him. Yet against the advice of his officers he gave them battle on ground where his forces were most unfavourably placed, especially the horse, who could not move with any freedom, the place was so rugged and uneven. He had not even his full number of men, for a large party had been sent to seize Castledoe. With unaccountable fatuity he persisted in giving the enemy battle. The two armies met at a place called Scariff Hollis, near Letterkenny, on the 21st of June, 1650, where the Ulster forces were utterly routed, this being the first time Owen Roe's brave Northerners had tasted defeat. O'Ferrall did everything in his power to discipline the troops beforehand. He led the infantry in the battle with his usual skill and bravery. Henry O'Neill, Owen Roe's son, performed prodigies of valour, but bravery is woeful waste of bone and sinew where success is impossible. The bishop escaped from the field, and accom-

* Aphor. Disc. Daniel O'Neill's letter to Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 346.

panied by a small party travelled day and night for twenty-four hours ; but unfortunately, Major King, Governor of Enniskillen, having got information of his movements, sent a party after him sufficiently numerous to capture him. He fought bravely and received many wounds, but at length yielded "upon promise that he should receive fair quarter, contrary to which, Sir Charles Coote, as soon as he knew he was a prisoner, caused him to be hanged with all the circumstances of contumely, reproach and cruelty he could desire."* His head was placed upon the walls of Derry. O'Ferrall and a few others escaped by flying to the mountains. 3,000 are said to have fallen on the field. Coote promised life and liberty to Colonel Phelim O'Neill (not *Sir* Phelim), on promise that he would procure for the said Coote one hundred beeves. Whilst the articles between them were being drawn up in Coote's tent a sergeant rushed in and announced that he had brought in as a prisoner Henry Roe O'Neill, the son of Owen Roe. Coote reprimanded him for not bringing his head. Colonel Phelim began to plead for his relative, saying he was a Spaniard born, and that he came to Ireland a soldier of fortune ; but his head was immediately cut off, and Coote told Colonel Phelim that if "he began to prate he would be served the same way." O'Neill's blood was stirred, and he made answer, "That he would rather be served so, than to owe his life to such a monstrous villain as he was ; whereupon he ordered him forthwith to be carried out, and knocked on the head with tent-poles by Sir Charles's men." This was a slow torturing death, meant, doubtless, by Coote to be so, but one of his officers "in compassion to him and to put him out of pain, drew his sword and ran him through the heart." His head, together with Henry Roe's, was also set up in Derry.†

Such were the Cootes, father and son ; and no doubt the reader has before now arrived at the conclusion that to compare them to Bengal tigers or hyenas mad with hunger would be a gross libel upon the wild beasts.

The great army of the great Owen Roe ended its career amid sorrow and defeat at Scariff Hollis.‡

Whilst Cromwell was pursuing his victorious career in Ireland,

* Clarendon's Historical Review of the Affairs of Ireland, p. 134.

† Desiderata Hib. Curiosa, Vol. II., p. 526.

‡ Written by the Four Masters, *Scairbh-sholais*. It is a ford on the river Swilly two miles west of Letterkenny. It is rendered into English "*Shallow ford of the light*." In former times it seems to have been a principal passage across the river, and lights were placed at it, to direct travellers to it at night and guide them to cross in safety. See Joyce's Irish Names, Vol. I., p. 219.

Charles the II. was an exile, and seems not to have been a welcome guest anywhere. He was at the Hague, having some claim to Dutch hospitality, but he would have been requested to withdraw from that place, had he not done so of his own accord. He had, it would seem, determined to come to Ireland, but the rapid change of circumstances here, or Ormonde's secret dislike to his coming, or both combined, caused that idea to be given up.* He was some time at St. Germain's, where the queen his mother resided, but he found his position very unpleasant there, on account of the coldness of the French Court towards him; so, after some dallying and delay, he withdrew to the Island of Jersey, where the governor, Sir George Cathcart, had remained thoroughly faithful to the royal cause. In Jersey he was visited by George Windham, or Wynram, on the part of the Scotch parliament, who invited him to settle in Scotland. It is said that Charles did not like the Covenant, which is likely enough, as it was much too strict and gloomy for his free and easy mode of life, but he was surrounded at Breda and elsewhere by men, who had instilled into him principles which he seems afterwards to have cherished through life, namely—"that honour and conscience were bugbears, and that the King ought to govern himself rather by the rules of prudence and necessity."† He received the proposal of the Scots very favourably, as Ormonde's defeat at Rathmines and Cromwell's sack of Drogheda had, for the time being, ruined his prospects in Ireland. He informed Windham that he would meet the Commissioners from the Parliament of Scotland at Breda in the ensuing March [1650]; but this arrangement did not prevent him from corresponding with Montrose, who had undertaken to raise Scotland in his favour.

Montrose made his attempt and was defeated, taken prisoner, and hanged on a gibbet thirty feet high. Between his arrest and execution he was treated with every indignity which the barbarous ingenuity of his enemies could invent. But he bore himself like a nobleman, in the highest sense of that word. He was quartered after his death, and his limbs distributed to various towns of Scotland. All this was suffered for the King. Montrose's attempt having had his full [if secret] approbation; but when he was hanged, drawn and quartered, the wretched

* Charles I. also wished to throw himself on the loyalty of the Irish. But the vast majority of the supporters of royalty here were Roman Catholics, and Ormonde, who hated the religion he had deserted, feared that if either Monarch came amongst us, moved by the enthusiasm his presence would be sure to evoke, he would be induced to make concessions, to which Ormonde could never assent.

† Carte's Letters, Vol. I., 391. Lingard, Vol. VIII., p. 168.

Charles wrote to the Scotch Parliament "protesting that the invasion made by Montrose had been expressly forbidden by him, and begging that they 'would do him the justice to believe that he had not been accessory to it in the least degree.' His Secretary, at the same time, assured Argyle that the King felt no regret for the defeat of a man who had presumed to draw the sword without, and contrary to, the royal command."* Thus, by meanest falsehood, did this miserable prince, to screen himself from blame, calumniate a man who had risked all and lost all—even life itself—in his cause.

Charles did not actually take the Covenant at Breda, but he signed a treaty binding himself to take both Covenants, namely, "the Scottish Covenant, and the Solemn League and Covenant; and to disavow and declare null the peace with the Irish; never to permit the free exercise of the Catholic religion in Ireland, or any other part of his dominions; to acknowledge the authority of all parliaments held from the commencement of the then late war; and to govern in civil matters by advice of the parliament,—in religions by that of the Kirk.† Matters having been so far arranged, Charles embarked on board a small squadron furnished by the Prince of Orange, and after a perilous navigation of three weeks, during which he had to contend with the stormy weather, and to elude the pursuit of the parliamentary cruisers, he arrived safely in the Frith of Cromarty on the 23rd of June; but was compelled to take the Covenant before permitted to land."‡

Ormonde was kept informed of the King's movements either by himself or those about him, as also of his negotiations with the Scots; so that he was acting at home with an amount of information which neither the Prelates nor the Commissioners of Trust possessed. There seems to be no doubt that he approved of the King's arrangement with the Scots about going to Scotland and taking the Covenant; yet with that double dealing by which he, in every eventuality, provided a defence or excuse for himself, he thus writes to Secretary Nicholas who, he knew, was adverse to the King's agreement with the Scots:—"I do not well remember what it was I writ to you from Youghal, touching the King's going into Scotland, nor have you sent me a copy of that letter (as I desired and still desire you would), as I

* Balfour, IV. 24, 25. Quoted by Lingard, Vol. VIII., p. 141.

† Thurloe, I., 147. The Scotch or National Covenant was a bond of union among the Scots themselves. The Solemn League and Covenant was made four or five years later between the Scotch and Puritan English Parliament.

‡ Sir E. Walker's Historical Discourse. Clarendon, Vol. III., pp. 365-6.

think my opinion was, that unless the King resolve entirely and without reserve, to give himself and his people up to the Covenant and Presbytery, he would not, upon any pretence of a possibility of meditating it, go into Scotland.”* He then expresses great apprehensions of the King’s danger, even in case he should resolve on a full compliance with the most rigid Covenanters. Yet in a letter to Ormonde from Lord Byron, then at Breda with the King, that nobleman assumes that Ormonde was quite in favour of the King coming to terms with the Scots, for he writes, “I received by Mr. Seymour the letter your Excellence was pleased to honour me with: and have, in order to what I found by him was your opinion concerning his Majesty’s conjunction with the Scots, contributed my best endeavours to the effecting of it, as being the only probable means to divert those streams of men and money, which daily flow out of England into Ireland, and which will, doubtless in a short time, if not prevented, overwhelm it.”†

The state of the Irish Nation after Cromwell’s successes was a sufficient cause for the assembling of the Congregation at Jamestown. Besides Charles’s agreement with the Scotch Commissioners who waited on him at Breda on the 15th of March, had, through various channels, reached Ireland; and further, it was asserted and believed that Ormonde had approved of that measure, and had even advised it. All was gloom and depression among the King’s supporters here. Such being the state of affairs, a number of bishops and other dignitaries assembled at Jamestown in the County Leitrim, on the 6th of August, 1650, for an interchange of views under circumstances so grave and perilous, and to determine what practical resolution should be adopted to protect religion and to save the country. The first step taken by the Congregation was to depute the Bishop of Dromore, and Dr. Kelly, Dean of Tuam, to wait on the Marquis of Ormonde, and to lay the views of the Prelates before him. These two delegates were the bearers of a letter to him, signed by all the prelates. They were also furnished with written in-

* Carte, Vol. III., p. 607.

† Carte’s Coll. of Original Papers, Vol. I., p. 333. The king’s agreement with the Scots did not stop the flow of men and money into Ireland, but it had the effect of turning many of his supporters in England against him. “By a letter from a perfectly loyal person from England,” writes a person of quality, “I am advertised that it’s not credible how freely and voluntarily the people in England list themselves to go against the Scots ever since the King’s declaration came from thence.”—*Ibid.*, Vol. I., p. 417. See also Curry’s Civil War, Vol. II., p. 31. *Obs.*—Carte’s apologetic account of Charles’s agreement with the Scots and his taking of the Covenant is as disingenuous a piece of writing as could be met with.

structions as to the chief matters they should press upon his Excellency's attention. These were four in number. 1. They were to call his Excellency's attention to the vast destruction and desolation which had fallen on the kingdom in a few months. 2. They were to warn him, that the people "seeing no visible army" for their defence, were in despair, and were inclined "to compound with the Parliament," which would bring ruin on the King's authority, on the Catholic Faith, and on the liberty of the nation. 3. "You are," they say to the delegates, "to protest before God, angels and men, in the name of the Congregation," that we did our best to remove fears and jealousies from the people, but that we had not power to do it; "the universal sense of the people being that *fate doth wait on those times*."* 4. They are to beg of his Excellency to retire from the country, and to leave the King's authority in the hands of trusty persons who will possess the affection and confidence of the people. And finally they are to press for an answer within a few days.†

The letter and instructions were dated 10th of August. Two days later, on the 12th, without waiting for Ormonde's reply, the assembly at Jamestown drew up and signed an excommunication against all Catholics who would "enlist under, feed, help, or adhere to his Excellency." This was very hastily done. Why not wait for the answer they asked for? It must be said, however, that although drawn up on the 12th of August, the Excommunication was only published on the 15th of September, at which date the King's taking of the Covenant was fully known in Ireland. The Excommunication was published with this limitation, "that the next General Assembly, which was soon to meet at Loughrea, should dispose of it as they thought proper." The Excommunication was suspended in favour of the Catholics in Clanrickarde's army, on the 16th of September, the day after its publication. This haste and fickleness were calculated to lessen the effects the Assembly at Jamestown intended the Excommunication should produce. The reason of the haste seems to have been, that it was known that Ormonde was collecting an army as quickly as he could, and the Prelates

* The meaning of this obscure passage probably is, that Ireland is fated to have no success whilst its destinies are in the hands of Ormonde. There is, no doubt, that for a considerable time before this, all reliance on Ormonde had departed from the Catholics, lay and clerical.

† Jamestown is small market-town of Leitrim, built on the Shannon, south of Carrick-on-Shannon. It was named after King James the First, who granted it to Sir Charles Coote, "together with several extensive landed estates in the county." This was after James had *planted* Leitrim, as he had planted Ulster. There had been a Franciscan Monastery in the place before the plantation.

hoped the existence of the Excommunication, which was sure to become known without any formal publication, would deter Catholics from taking service under him.

The Excommunication was accompanied by a "Declaration," which consisted of a number of charges against Ormonde.

In the opening paragraph the Assembly prove their loyalty to the King, showing that they made the Peace of 1648 at a time when he was under restraint, and when neither the Queen nor Prince could send them assistance. They signed that Peace "when they could have agreed with the Parliament of England, upon as good or better conditions of religion, and the lives, liberties and estates of the people, than were obtained by the above Pacification; and thereby freed themselves from the danger of any invasion or war." "Let the world judge," they say, "if this be not an undeniable argument of loyalty."

The Peace having been concluded, the Catholic Confederates placed themselves cheerfully under his Majesty's authority, and provided well nigh half a million of money, with magazines of corn, artillery, powder, &c.; after which the Marquis of Ormonde "became the Author of losing nearly the whole kingdom to God, King and Natives."

They also accuse him of giving important places in the army to untrustworthy men, who afterwards betrayed or deserted the Confederates; in this charge they especially refer to the officers of Inchiquin's army.

They complain that the system of administering justice promised by the articles of the Peace was never put in practice, a circumstance which greatly impeded its due administration. They assert "that the Catholic subjects of Munster lived in slavery, under the Presidency of Lord Inchiquin; these being their judges that before were their enemies, and none of the Catholic nobility or gentry admitted to be of the tribunal." "The conduct of the army," they say, "was improvident and unfortunate. Nothing happened in Christianity more shameful than the disaster of Rathmines, near Dublin, where his Excellency (as it seemed to ancient travellers, and men of experience who viewed all) kept rather a mart of wares, a tribunal of pleadings, or a great inn of play, drinking and pleasure, than a well-ordered camp of souldiers."

They blame Ormonde for the loss of Drogheda, Wexford, Ross and many other places, dwelling in an especial manner upon the surrender of Ross.

All these things, they say, have compelled the Congregation of Archbishops, Bishops, &c., "to declare against the continuance of his Majesty's authority in the person of the Marquis of

Ormonde;" and they further declare that the people "are no longer *obliged* to obey the orders and commands of the said Marquis of Ormonde," but are (until an Assembly of the Nation can be called) to serve against the common enemy [meaning the Parliament] "for the defence of the Catholic Religion, his Majesty's interest, their liberties, lives and fortunes, in pursuance of the Oath of Association, and to observe and obey, in the meantime, the form of Government the said Congregation shall prescribe, until it be otherwise ordered by an Assembly, or until, upon application to his Majesty, he settle the same otherwise."*

Ormonde defended himself against these charges with his usual hauteur and ability, and a good deal of angry correspondence passed between him and the Prelates at Jamestown, without any practical result. He called a General Assembly at Loughrea (where he had for some time resided in one of Clanrickarde's houses), which met on the 15th of November, 1650. It consisted almost altogether of laymen. Sir R. Blake was chosen its chairman. To this Assembly Ormonde announced his intention of retiring from the kingdom. To make this communication appears to have been the only reason for calling its members together, for no other business seems to have been done on the occasion.†

There had been several meetings or Councils of the Irish Prelates in 1649 and 1650. The first of these was held at Clonmacnoise, December, 1649, commencing on the 4th of that month. They met as they said "of their own motion" (*proprio motu*) to exchange views with regard to the dangers which then threatened religion. The meeting was large. The four Archbishops and sixteen bishops attended; other dioceses were represented by ecclesiastics duly accredited (*procuratores*), and several heads of religious houses were also present. They came to an agreement on some points, the chief of which were:—

* Cox, Appendix XLVIII., pp. 178, et seq.

† The Excommunication from Jamestown was signed by 10 bishops, 3 Procurators [representatives of bishops], 13 Heads of Religious Houses and Theologians. The Excommunication was accepted and ratified unanimously by 6 bishops then sitting at Galway (who probably could not get safely to Jamestown), and was signed by them on the 23rd August, 1650, the first signature being Thomas, Archbishop of Cashel. This was Most Rev. Thomas Walsh, who filled that See from 1626 to 1654. In 1632, he wrote to Propaganda, "*e loco refugii nostri*," giving an account of the Ecclesiastical province of Cashel. The excommunication was a *major ipso facto* one. The Marquis of Ormonde was excommunicated by name, together with all who would feed, help, or adhere to him, or bear arms for him.—*Lib. H.*, 1 col. VII. Record Tower, Dublin Castle.

- I. They enjoin prayer, fasting and general confessions.
- II. That the Catholics were not to expect anything in favour of religion from the "common enemy" commanded by Cromwell.
- III. They enjoin amity and union. The sowers of dissensions to be punished by their lawful superiors.
- IV. A band of robbers called Idle Boys were excommunicated for robbing their neighbours, and levying contributions on them.

The decrees are signed WALTERUS CONFERTENSIS. Sec.—Dr. Walter Lynch, Bishop of Clonfert.

The Commissioners of Trust, a body vested with much power but possessing little influence, having replaced the dissolved Confederation, there was no organization through which Ormonde could reach the Catholics, except their bishops. It would seem, therefore, to have been his design that they should sit permanently in some place where he would be near enough to influence their deliberations. In the beginning of March, 1650, he invited twenty-four of them to meet him in Limerick, which city he, doubtless, intended to make his head-quarters, Dublin having passed out of his hands through his own fault. But as the Limerick people refused to receive him with his full unshackled authority, that design had to be given up. However, the bishops and some of the principal lay Catholics went to Limerick, where Ormonde held a Conference with them. Two points he put strongly before them, without which, he said, nothing could be done for the advancement of his Majesty's service or the preservation of the people. These points were:—(1.) that the people should be induced to place full confidence in him; (2.) that Limerick should be persuaded to receive a garrison, and obey his orders.

The Prelates, on their side, drew up a paper containing eleven articles, which they called "Remedies proposed to his Excellency for removing the discontents and distrusts of the people, and for advancing his Majesty's service." The chief of these Remedies were as follows. 1. The establishment of a Privy Council is recommended, according to ancient custom; such Privy Council to consist of peers and others, "Natives of the kingdom." This proviso did not exclude Anglo-Irish. 2. It would seem that the management of the army, as to numbers, pay, &c., had gone into great confusion, and for this they proposed immediate and radical remedies. 3. They strongly urge that in the reorganization of the army those who had proved themselves untrustworthy, and those against whom distrust was justly entertained, should be excluded from places of power and authority. And indeed the siege of

Limerick by Ireton, which came on soon after, showed the necessity of this "remedy." 4. They called for proper tribunals for administering justice according to the Articles of the Peace. 5. They suggest that a proper balance sheet should be demanded from the Receiver-General, who, for a long time had rendered no account of the large sums he had received. 6. They complain of the extortions and oppressions of the officers of the army, and ask that a Council of War should be appointed to take charge of the affairs of the army. 7. They ask that no impositions, free quarters, &c., should be placed on the people, except by the Commissioners of Trust.

Ormonde replied seriatim to the eleven Remedies proposed by the Bishops. He repeats what he had said to them a short time before, that there must be full reliance placed in him as the King's representative, and that the duty of the Prelates was to remove the "causeless distrusts" that were maliciously infused into the people's minds, and which "slackened and partly withdrew" obedience to his Majesty as vested in him, Ormonde. He does not, he says, see the want of a Privy Council, as he thinks the Commissioners of Trust, by "the knowledge and ability" they possessed, the most reliable advisers he could have. Now Ormonde knew as well as the Prelates themselves the reason for proposing a Privy Council; which was, that all power should not be in his hands, as was virtually the case, inasmuch as the Commissioners of Trust were his mere creatures. By this uncontrolled power he kept a number of persons about him, whom the country distrusted and rightly distrusted, for they were partly his spies and partly his tools; but Ormonde, of course, ignores this and gives the Bishops a perfunctory answer. Consulting and relying on the Commissioners of Trust meant, in the case, consulting and relying upon himself, for they were the merest cyphers as far as any participation in the government was concerned. He put them forward as important people when it suited his purpose. When he did not wish to follow a certain course or to adopt certain suggestions, all he had to say was that the Commissioners of Trust were against them.

As to the other points in the Bishop's "Remedies," he expressed a readiness to meet their wishes, and to give his best consideration to their proposal, but he yielded nothing. This was Ormonde all over—specious words, postponement, no concession. In his reply to the eleventh and last article of the "Remedies," he acknowledges that the Articles of the Peace were infringed "by unavoidable necessity," in order to provide for the army; yet he would not consent to the appointment of a

Council of War, which would put the management of it on a proper footing. Ormonde, in a word, was to be everything; under his orders the Catholics were to continue to shed their blood in the King's service, whilst their grievances and oppressions were always to remain in the background, or if ever brought forward by the sufferers, they were to be minimised by Ormonde, and smothered over with some sweet diplomatic phraseology.

Ormonde "appointed two meetings to be at Loughrea [the first on the 19th of March, and the second on the 25th of April, 1650], and summoned thither all the Catholic Bishops, as many of the Nobility as could with any security come thither; the chief gentlemen of quality in the parts adjacent, and several officers of the army, which being met together, he gave them, in the first place, an answer in writing to the grievances which had been presented to him at the former meeting in which," according to Clarendon, "he made evident how much they were mistaken in much of the matters of fact, and that what was really amiss proceeded from themselves, and their not observing the orders and rules they were bound by, and could not be prevented by him . . . He showed them a letter he had lately received from his master the King, bearing date the second February from Jersey [in reply to one he had written to him in December], in which his Majesty signified his pleasure to him 'that in case of the continuance of disobedience in the people and contempt for his authority, his Lieutenant should withdraw himself and his Majesty's authority out of the kingdom.'"^{*}

This, which was evidently intended to put pressure on the Assembly, had a very considerable effect. They made him a dutiful reply, in which, amongst other things, they said that "as they had already by the expending of their substance in an extraordinary measure, and their lives upon all occasions, abundantly testified their sincere and immovable affections to preserve his Majesty's rights and interests entire to him, so they would, for the future, with like cheerfulness, endeavour to overcome all difficulties which the enemy's power and success had laid in their way."[†] The Marquis on this changed his mind, "and declined his purpose of quitting the kingdom" if he had seriously entertained the project. This was during the earlier days of May, 1650.

^{*} Clarendon's Historical Review, &c., p. 120.

[†] Ibid., p. 121.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE disastrous battle of Scariff Hollis had caused Ormonde to turn his anxious attention to Limerick; it was the last important place held for the King, except Galway. He proceeded to Limerick, and used every means in his power to induce the citizens to receive a garrison from him. To this they did not consent, neither did they, in the first instance, in any decided way, refuse it. But it is clear from their negotiations with the Marquis, that they had a strong disinclination to put their city in his hands, or in those of his creatures. Ormonde and his clever, undeviating eulogist, Carte, pretend that this was all done by the clergy, in order to have authority centred in themselves. It is not necessary to go back on Ormonde's treacheries, but I may repeat that the Catholic clergy worked and bled with the most heroic resignation for the cause of their religion and King, which they regarded as substantially the one cause, and they justly refused to trust Ormonde, who, on every occasion, exercised all his ability and cunning to use them in fighting for the royal cause, and at the same time to keep them in a state of abject slavery. We need not go far to account for the action of the people of Limerick in refusing a garrison from Ormonde, whom they well knew was not to be trusted; for royalist though he was, he played notoriously false to his King in giving up Dublin to the English rebels, in the person of Michael Jones, and he was a traitor to the Catholics and false to the King in withholding from them the concessions, which the King ordered him to grant them. What wonder that Catholic Limerick should refuse a garrison of his choosing? They resolved to accept no garrison from Ormonde, but expressed their willingness to admit a garrison of Ulstermen, if commanded by the Bishop of Limerick, Hugh O'Neill or Murtagh O'Brien. This was right and reasonable, but they went further and denied the Marquis the courtesy due to his position as Viceroy. This he felt deeply. It was a proceeding not to be palliated, and somewhat unworthy of a brave, high-minded people. A garrison exclusively of Ulstermen under Hugh O'Neill, the famous defender of Clonmel, was at length admitted.

Ludlow cherished a great hatred for Cromwell, and no doubt Cromwell knew this, for, to do Ludlow justice, he did not seek to

conceal it, in the House of Commons or elsewhere. On Cromwell's return to England after his Irish campaign, he took, or pretended to take, Ludlow into his confidence, and after some time he proposed to him to go to Ireland as general of the horse, and second in command to Ireton. Ludlow says his private affairs were in such confusion, that he endeavoured to avoid the employment; but his friends suggested that the thing was proposed by the wily Oliver to get him out of the way, lest he should prove an obstruction to his designs. Ludlow did not concur in this opinion, saying, with apparent modesty, that he did not believe himself so "considerable," as to be regarded as one who stood in the way of Cromwell's designs. Oliver continued to urge the appointment upon him, and he, at length, acquiesced.

The first weighty undertaking resolved on by Ireton was the Siege of Limerick, and he lost no time in preparing for it. The *Aphorismical* author says, his army was partly or wholly before that city for about a year and a half—a year at the Munster side, and half a year at the Connaught side, after he had crossed the river near Killaloe.* This statement is substantially correct. Ireton was of course unable to invest Limerick completely until a part of his forces had crossed the Shannon. The troops told off for that service were at Castle Connell and in the neighbourhood of Killaloe and O'Brien's Bridge, from the time he had first appeared before Limerick, watching a favourable opportunity to get over. On Sunday, the 6th of October, 1650, the Parliamentary army appeared within three miles of Limerick, and on the 7th, having approached still nearer, Ireton demanded a passage for his troops through the city, to which, if his request were granted, he promised protection. As the Mayor refused,† Ireton held a council of war, wherein it was resolved "not to proceed by way of force" against Limerick at that time, on account of the season being far advanced, and for other reasons. But it was agreed to build a bridge at Castle Connell, a place which had been inspected by Ireton some days before. Thus we see that whilst a part of Ireton's army remained in the neighbourhood of Limerick, another division of it was, at the same time, placed at Castle Connell to make preparations for crossing the Shannon, which

* In the Co. Clare, which was at that time regarded as a Connaught county.

† Three or four months earlier, in June, "Cromwell sent propositions to Limerick offering them the free exercise of their religion, enjoyment of their estates, churches and church-livings, a free trade and commerce, and no garrison to be pressed upon them, provided they would give a free passage to his forces through the city into the county of Clare."—*Carte's Ormonde*, Vol. II., p. 123.

was not accomplished until the 2nd of June, 1651. So that the Parliamentary army was eight months at Castle Connell before they were able to get to the Clare side.*

The first important step made by the army of the Parliament towards crossing the river was taking possession of a small island in mid-stream between their camp and Killaloe. They at once planted some guns upon it, and from this vantage ground were enabled to observe Castlehaven's movements and the progress of his defences.

The account which Ludlow gives of the crossing the Shannon by Ireton's army cannot be reconciled with that given by Castlehaven. Ludlow says that he and Ireton out-manceuvred Castlehaven and so crossed the river; Castlehaven says they bribed two of his officers, Kelly and Fennell, and by this means got possession of the passes at O'Brien's Bridge and Killaloe.†

Be this as it may, Ireton having settled on the points he would try to cross at, had boats and cots brought overland from Dromineer, some of which were put into the water above Killaloe, others at the island already in his possession.‡ The boats were placed at Killaloe as a feint to alarm the Confederates. Being in rough water there, they could not be made use of, even if it were desirable to do so. O'Brien's Bridge was the point selected for making the real effort to cross the river. Both Ireton and the Lieut.-General commanded there; Sir Hardress Waller being left with the rest of the army in the vicinity of Killaloe. About daybreak on the 2nd of June (Monday), Captain Draper was ordered to cross opposite to O'Brien's Bridge, which, "with 3 files of firelocks," he succeeded in doing. Having gained land on the Clare side, he fastened ropes to the bank which, extending across the river, facilitated the towing of the boats over. Within an hour 500 men had crossed.§ Six troopers passed over with the 3 files of musketeers in the first instance. Having unsaddled their horses, they caused them to swim by the boat, and safely landed

* *Castleconnell*, a small town partly in Tipperary and partly in Limerick, was then in possession of the Parliamentary troops. It is about 6 miles N.E. of Limerick on the Shannon. *O'Brien's bridge* is a village at the Clare side of the river, nearly opposite Castleconnell. Killaloe, also at the Clare side, is 12 miles above Limerick. It was along the reach of the Shannon, between Castleconnell and Killaloe, that Ireton's forces and those of Castlehaven were face to face with each other for so long a period.

† Castlehaven asserts without doubt that Kelly sold the pass at O'Brien's bridge. He speaks less confidently of Fennell's treachery; but he would be lenient to him, because he was one of Ormonde's tools.

‡ "A cut is a kind of vessel of one piece hollowed, and some of them capable of thirty men." *Diary of Parliamentary Forces*; Aphor. Disc., Vol. III., p. 228.

§ *Ibid.*, 230.

them at the other side.* One will naturally inquire what was Castlehaven and his two thousand horse and foot doing, while Ireton's forces were getting across and establishing themselves at the Clare side? Here is the commander's own explanation: "For some days past, I kept a guard towards Connaught, [whence he was expecting Coote on 'his back,' as he said], when Ireton, by treachery of the officer, one Captain Kelly, made himself master of a pass called Brien's Bridge. Whilst I was hastening with some troops to oppose him, having left the defence of the pass of Killaloe to Colonel Fennell, he cowardly or treacherously quitted it, and with his party fled into Limerick, where upon the reddition of the town, which was not long after, Ireton, with more than his ordinary justice, hanged him."† Castlehaven having, as he says, letters from the Lord Deputy to hasten and join him, did so, and found him in Loughrea.

Ludlow makes the passage of the river at O'Brien's Bridge a very important affair. "Some of the enemy's horse came and skirmished with ours," he writes, "and later about a thousand of their foot advancing, our horse was commanded to retire, which they did with some reluctancy; but the hasty march of their foot was retarded by our guns, which we had planted on a hill at our side of the river, from whence we fired so thick upon them, that they were forced to retreat under the shelter of a rising ground, where after they had been awhile, and considered what to do, finding ours coming over apace to them, instead of attacking us, they began to think it high time to provide against our falling upon them; and having sent to all their guards upon the river to draw off, they retreated farther through the woods into their own quarters."‡ The Diary of the Parliamentary forces agrees in the main with Ludlow about the passage of the river, but does not make so much of it. "The enemy," it says, "at first with some horse and foote gave opposition, but by the loud shouting of our men, from the other side, and sounding of trumpets, and discharging our great shot, and by shot made from the castle and house last taken, it pleased God to strike such terror into their hearts that they quitted their works and fled."§

* Ludlow's Memoirs, p. 347.

† Castlehaven's Memoirs, p. 138. "Some say he (Fennell) was carried to Cork, and there pleaded for his defence, not only this service, but how he had betrayed me before Youghal; but his judges would not hear him on his merits, but bid him clear himself of the murders laid to his charge."—*Ibid.*

‡ Ludlow's Memoirs, p. 348.

§ *Diary of Parliamentary Forces*, Aphor. Dis., Vol. III., pp. 230-1. Colonel Ingoldsby with 300 horse crossed opposite Castle Connell, whilst the main body was crossing at O'Brien's Bridge, and had a brush with the Confederate troops who were flying towards Limerick.

Whatever orders the letters of the Lord Deputy to Castlehaven may have contained, the successful crossing of the Shannon by Ireton left him no choice; he was compelled to shift his quarters without delay. This he did as we learn from the following passages:—

“Castlehaven (whose quarters were at Killaloe) had, the night before, heard that the Lord President (Sir Charles Coote), and the Commissary General were advanced as farre as Gortinsegory in the County of Galway, about [*blank*] miles from Killaloe, which was but a false alarm; yet did that also contribute much to our worke; the Lord in that [*as** in that apprehended noise of chariots and horsemen, where none were, he made the Syrian flee besieging Samaria, 2 Kings, 7 : 6 :] causing our enemies a general feare that by the coming on of that our party they might be by them and us enclosed and destroyed.”

“Therefore conceived they it high time to provide for their security; yet for colouring their so goeing away, Castlehaven gave out that he would hasten to join with Clanrickard for opposing Sir Charles Coote, and that lesse numbers than those with him would suffice to oppose those attempting over the river. But that his marching away was soone turned to plain fleeing, newes being brought him of our so landing at Brian’s bridge, whereupon they all fled and quitted their defences about Killaloe, and gave ours there also a quiet landing. For about breake of day at the wood above Killaloe our men drawne thither were some of them landed on the other side without opposition, notwithstanding great number of the enemy there standing and looking on a while, as amazed not finding their hands but after fleeing everywhere.”†

“Castlehaven himselfe fled leaveing his tent, plate, and other conveniences for a prey. We found there 50 bundles of good pikes and 5 barrells of powder, with bullets and match and pistols and carabine bullets in good proportions, also many pioneers’ tooles, and in the trenches and workes on the river we found many armes and tooles, those who should have used them being fled with their generall.”‡

“Castlehaven’s forces were (by the country) numbered to us for 5 regiments of horse and as many of foote, but nothing

* Partly erased in MS.

† This account would agree very well with the opinion that Fennell was a traitor. “Not finding their hands,”—not *finding* them so as to make use of them.
—J. O’R.

‡ Castlehaven went to Loughrea, where Clanrickarde was with about 300 horse; the remainder of his men went to Limerick or dispersed.

answerable in numbers ; yet more than enough (looking to man) for opposing anything we could doe considering the difficulty of passing the river, which we found dangerous enough without any opposition otherwaies.”*

Ireton having placed a garrison at Killaloe, moved his army towards Limerick the day after he had passed the Shannon. On coming to a place called the Pass of Ferboe about a mile from Limerick, the Parliamentary army found it defended against them by about 300 horse and some foot, sent out from the city for that purpose. Ingoldsby and his party, as already stated, crossed the river below O'Brien's Bridge, and thus became the van of the army in its march on Limerick. He, therefore, came face to face with the defenders of the pass before the main body had reached it. He forced the pass, routed those who held it, and pursued them towards the city, killing, the account says, some 150 of them and taking a number of prisoners. Ireton arrived soon after and took up a position within the pass. He ordered a party of horse and foot “to ly at distance” on the Munster side of Limerick ; which probably meant, that those troops who had previously retired to some distance from the city at that side, were now to approach nearer to it. On the same day Colonel Sankey joined them with reinforcements from Clonmel. They spent Friday, the 13th of June, in praising the Lord ; returning Him thanks for bringing them over the Shannon, and for having sent them good news from Connaught about the doings of that “babe of grace” Cooté.† On the next day Ireton summoned Limerick to surrender, and gave emphasis to the summons by opening fire on the Castle of Thomond bridge with 28 guns and two mortars, whilst two other mortars played upon the town. On the 16th a drum [a messenger] from the town announced that the citizens wished to treat, and brought also the request that Commissioners would be appointed for that purpose, that hostages should be given and a cessation proclaimed during the sitting of the Commissioners.

Ireton accepted this offer to treat of a surrender, but refused the request for a cessation and the giving of hostages. Six Commissioners were appointed on each side. Those for the city were, Major-General Purcell, W. Stackpoole, the Recorder, Col. Butler, Jeffrey Barron, who had been one of the Supreme

* *Diary of Parliamentary Forces.* Aphor. Disc., Vol. III., pp. 230-1. *Ibid.*, p. 232.

† The day of thanksgiving was ordered by Ireton in a very elaborate address to the army. It was as pious and puritanical as could be, but it wanted the ring of inspiration which we find in the same sort of documents when coming from the great Oliver.

Council, Mr. Baggot, and Alderman Fanning ; the Commissioners at Ireton's side were, Major-General Waller, Colonel Cromwell, Major Smith, Adjutant-General Allen, General Ludlow, and another whose name Ludlow had forgotten when writing his *Memoirs*.*

"We met," writes Ludlow, "in a tent placed between the town and our camp, where we dined together and treated of conditions for several days ; but they having great expectations of relief, either by the King's success against us in Scotland, or by the drawing together of their own parties in Ireland, who were able to form an army more numerous than ours, insisted upon such excessive terms, that the treaty was broken up without coming to any conclusion."† The attack was continued against the Castle "beyond" Thomond Bridge (*i.e.* at Ireton's side of it), and a breach having been made, "one Mr. Hacket, a stout gentleman of the guard," was appointed to lead a storming party through the breach to attempt its capture. They succeeded, although not more than twenty in number. Ireton encouraged by this success at once began to prepare for an attack on King's Island, a large tract of ground at the north of the city. Ludlow estimates its extent at from 40 to 50 acres. It is enclosed between the Shannon and the Abbey river, and it was on the southern portion of it the then city of Limerick stood. Boats were prepared and floats sufficient to transport three hundred men at once ; orders were given to move down the river about midnight, and 3 regiments of foot and one of horse were appointed to be wafted over. The first 300, being all foot, commanded by Lieut.-Colonel Waller, having landed on the island, marched up to the Confederates' breast work, where they got such a hot reception, that most of them were forced into the water, and all either killed or drowned except two or three who returned to the camp with the woful tidings.

During the progress of the siege much fighting was carried on not only around the walls of Limerick, but at places a considerable distance from it. Strong detachments of the Parliamentary troops were sent through the country in search of the Confederate forces, and to look out for provisions, which at times were very short with the large force before the city. One of those expeditions, consisting of 1,000 horse, was led by Ludlow towards Connaught to open communications with Coote, who having

* Ludlow's *Memoirs*, p. 356. The commissioners who represented the city were divided thus :—2 for the soldiers, 2 for the city, and 2 for the clergy.—*Diary of Parliamentary Forces*. Aphor. Disc., Vol. III., p. 240.

† *Memoirs*, 356. *Ibid.*, 357.

been made Lord President of that province, had entered it by way of Ballyshannon. Ireton, whilst vigilant and active as a general, was not neglectful of other means of success. He opened communications with some traitors within the walls of Limerick, even before his troops had got to the Connaught side of it, as we learn from an entry in the diary of an officer of the Parliamentary forces under date of May 20, [1651]. "This night," he writes, "was there expectation of a designe on Limerick by correspondency with some within. Coll. Ingoldesby (an active and vigilant officer and well meriting of the service) appeareing in the worke had placed himselfe conveniently with 1,000 horse, foote and dragoones, neere the city for taking hold of the opportunity to be offered, but (I knew not how) the plot failing, as few in that kinde were found to take, ours retired without losse although under shot of the walls."*

The supplies so plentifully granted to Cromwell during his Irish campaign were continued to Ireton. Ships from England laden with munitions of war and provisions began, after some time, to appear in the Shannon, and the first foothold secured at the Connaught side of the river was obtained by a Parliamentary ship under command of one Captain Branby. On the 29th of May news reached Ireton at Killaloe from that commander, that he had taken Sir Tege McMahon's castle, on "the other" [Connaught] side of the river, Branby further stating that he had fortified it, and had repulsed "the enemy" in an attempt to recover it.†

The Marquis of Ormonde having fallen into discredit with the Catholics, and despairing of being able to effect anything for the royal cause under existing circumstances, took ship for France at Galway, on the 6th of December, O.S., 1650. He appointed the Marquis of Clanrickarde, Lord Deputy, in his absence. Thus, at that time, there were two Lords Lieutenant, Ormonde and Cromwell; but being both absent from the country, they were represented by two Lords Deputy, Clanrickarde and Ireton. Clanrickarde had a good army in Connaught, where he was really powerful, but according to Castlehaven its strength was not more than half of Coote's. Lord Muskerry was at the head of a pretty numerous force in Munster, but was "waited on" (*i.e.* watched) by the Lord Broghill, who foiled every attempt of his to relieve Limerick. There was an army in the field in Leinster, commanded by Colonel John Fitz-

* Diary of Parliamentary Forces ; Aphor. Disc., Vol. III., p. 227.

† Diary of Parliamentary Forces ; Aphor. Disc., Vol. III., p. 228.

patrick, numbering 4,000 or 5,000; but it was more noted for its exactions from the people than for the performance of any substantial service.* It was hoped that Clanrickarde could have held Galway, and with it the most part of Connaught, but the hope was dashed by Coote's bold invasion of that Province in June, 1651. Besides being a heartless savage, he quite overmatched Clanrickarde in generalship.

The army that Coote led into Connaught was drafted from various garrisons in Ulster. A good part of them mustered at Ballyshannon, after they had crossed the river Erne, and here Coote joined them with a party of horse and foot, and took the command. Having rested four days, they marched towards Sligo, where they were joined by more detachments. A party was sent out to discover the whereabouts of Clanrickarde; they found that he had taken possession of the passes of the Curlew mountains, over which Coote wanted to pass. So strongly was Clanrickarde posted there, that Coote felt it would be a most perilous undertaking for him to attempt to force a passage. He, therefore, prudently determined to seek a passage by some other route; "and accordingly, leaving the Curlews on the left hand, he turned towards the sea, and by strange and unexpected ways, by Ballaghy pass† got undiscovered into the county Mayo. Herein they gained the advantage of open ground for their horse, and gained in ground of the enemy neere two days' march, who were now in the reare of them."‡

Clanrickarde, finding Coote had got past him without his knowledge, followed him, and sent parties in different directions to warn the people to put their cattle and provisions out of the reach of Coote's army. On the 31st of May, Coote reached Athenry, whence he marched to Loughrea with the hopes of engaging Clanrickarde who was there, but the latter avoided giving him battle, for which he was not to blame, as Coote's army was much superior to his in numbers. Coote pushed on to Portumna, a Castle of Clanrickarde's, which, after some resistance, was given up to him on conditions.

When Ludlow and his party of 1,000 horse had gone about forty miles westward, news reached him that Coote was at Port-

* After some time Fitzpatrick made terms with the Parliamentarians, promising to lay down his arms on a certain day, and transport 4,000 men to Spain. For promoting this design, he was excommunicated. His men deserted him in great numbers and placed themselves under Colonel Grace, Colonel Lewis O'Moore, and others of their officers.—*Aphor. Disc.*, Vol. III., p. 44.

† A village in the parish of Achonry in the County Sligo, but on the frontier of Mayo, on the road to Swinford.

‡ *Diary of Parliamentary Forces.* Aphor. Disc., Vol. iii., pp. 232-3.

umna. "Upon this notice," he writes, "leaving my party advantageously posted in a place furnished with provisions for themselves and horses, I took with me sixty horse and went to Portumna, to be informed more particularly concerning the state of affairs. At my arrival I understood that an attempt had been made upon the place, wherein our men had been repulsed, but that the enemy having a large line to keep, and many poor people within, fearing to hazard another assault, had agreed to surrender upon articles next morning, which was done accordingly."*

Ludlow, having found Coote's party "in good condition; and able to deal with the enemies at that side," began his march back to Limerick, taking some castles on his return journey.

Coote left a garrison in Portumna Castle, and turned westward towards Athlone, to take which was probably a chief design of his from the beginning. Sir Robert Talbot was then governor there for the Confederates. This stronghold, the key of Connaught from the Leinster side, does not seem to have offered any great resistance, for the articles agreed upon when it was surrendered bear date the 18th of June, 1651, whilst, as stated above, it was the 31st of May when Coote reached Athenry, whence he proceeded to Loughrea, probably two days' march, and thence to Portumna, where he had some days' delay. After this he turned his face westward again towards Athlone, keeping at the Connaught side of the river. This was a journey of several days, so that he could not have been more than a week before Athlone until it was surrendered. The articles, which are not very stringent, were signed on the part of the Confederates by Sir James Dillon and Sir Robert Talbot.†

During the last days of August or the beginning of September, Ireton, accompanied by Ludlow, taking with them about 4,000 men, horse and foot, made a dash into Clare, chiefly in search of provisions, which were sorely needed by the large army then before Limerick, as also to have a brush with the Con-

* Memoirs, p. 350.

† Aphor. Discovery, Vol. III., p. 215.

Men, provisions, and arms continued to be received from England, as the following entry shows:—"Friday 27 June, the Major General returned to head quarters from Waterford, bringing to us 2,500 men, new recruits there lately landed. Then also did we hear of 2,000 men more coming out of England, and that there was landed at Waterford £4,000 and 4,000 stand of arms." *Diary of Parliamentary Forces*. Aphor. Disc., p. 241.

"We heard that the treasure landed at Waterford was £50,000; that there were brought thither 500 barrels of powder, 6,000 barrels of wheat, 7,000 muskets, . . . and that a vessel with wheat and rye of 200 tunnes was coming to the leagure." *Ibid.*, p. 249.

federates, should they come across them. Of these they sighted several bodies, now and then, but never got within fighting distance of them. The two commanders, after some time, divided their troops into two parties, hoping thereby to catch or hem in the Confederates somewhere or other, but all to no purpose. Their whole success consisted in bringing some horses and cattle back to head quarters. In their absence a sortie in force was made from the city, so secretly and with such rapidity, that the besiegers were taken completely by surprise, and were for a time in great peril, but, being reinforced, they held their ground, and O'Neill's men returned in good order to the city under shelter of their guns. The affair seems to have so frightened Sir Hardress Waller, who commanded in the absence of Ireton and Ludlow, that he lost no time in communicating with them, and Ireton at once returned to Limerick, leaving Ludlow with 2,000 men to attempt the taking of Clare Castle; but failing in this he too returned, and in conjunction with Ireton, began to make preparations for a winter siege.*

Meanwhile numbers of people endeavoured to get out of the town. "The Deputy commanded them to return, and threatened to shoot any that should attempt to come out in the future: but this not being sufficient to make them desist, he caused two or three to be taken in order to be executed, and the rest to be whipped back into the town. One of those that were to be hanged was the daughter of an old man, who was in that number which was to be sent back: he desired that he might be hanged in the room of his daughter, but that was refused, and he with the rest driven back to the town." Ludlow says one or two were hanged in sight of the city to terrify those within and restrain them from coming out, but that those who were hanged were condemned for other crimes.†

Ireton, having for a year and more used every means in his power to take Limerick, but without success, was greatly distressed at the prospect of a winter siege. He and his men were already utterly weary of the business. There was sickness without, and Hugh O'Neill and the plague, two powerful enemies, were within ready to pounce upon them; their ranks were thinned, too, by fatigue and the effects of a climate to which they were unaccustomed. The author of the *Aphor. Discovery* says they lost 8,000 men before Limerick in a year. Yet the end did not seem near. There was no prospect before

* Ludlow's *Memoirs*, p. 368.

† *Memoirs*, Vol. I., p. 369.

them but a continuation of their efforts through the winter which no amount of preparation could disarm of its deadly influence; and should the plague rush out among them in good earnest, a very probable contingency, there was no forecasting what would be the end. Ireton's position was narrowed to this—he must either make a supreme effort of some kind or raise the siege. To raise the siege would bring disgrace if not ruin upon him, so he resolved upon the supreme effort, which was to try bribery instead of bullets. The *Aphorismical* author quaintly says:—"By this later discussion of affairs the warie general doe comence to attempt the victorie by silver-plate bulletts (as failinge in the ordinarie of other metal), dispatched several addresses under Major-General Neylle, importinge high protestations of great preferments if he yielded both citty and person. But this gentleman was soe honorable, that for a world did not betraye the trust reposed on him, by the kingdome, alleadinge in his result that he was intrusted therein by the consent of both government, citty, and new elected protector of the kingdome, his Highnesse the Duke of Lorraine,* and upon the undertakinge thereof, did promise to keep it for a twelvemonth, and that much (prayse to God) now finished, did intende to keep it (though not relieved) for a twelvemonth more, which expired, if his Lordship had the patience to waite upon it till then, as he did see reason, was willinge to complye with his Lordship's desire in any lawfull and honorable atonement. Interim humbly desired his Lordship, as well to pardon him, as not to trouble himself in any such matter, as too foreign to his being; which is, Sir, to be your humble servant Hugh O'Neyle."†

* In his reply to a summons from Sir Hardress Waller, dated 16th January, 1650, O'Neill says:—"I am entrusted with this place from my Lord Lieutenant to maintain it for the use of his Majesty King Charles, which I resolve, by God's assistance, to perform, . . . even to the effusion of the last drop of my blood." *Aphor. Disc.*, Ap. p. xvii. p. 180.

The above letter was written eight or nine months later, when it was supposed Lorraine had become Protector of Ireland.

† *Aphorismical Discovery*, Vol. III., p. 19. It would seem that an attempt was also made to bribe Dr. Terence O'Brien, bishop of Emly. In the Acts of a General Chapter of the Dominican order held in Rome in 1656, and presided over by Fr. John Baptist de Marines, General of the Order, the following passage occurs, regarding the Bishop of Emly:—"Cum Anno 1651 ageret in Civitate Limericensi quam tunc Henricus Irton, Cromwelli gener, verusque Hiberniæ Procromwellus, atroci obsidione stringebat, præclarum integritatis, atque constantiæ specimen dedit, siquidem à prænominato Hæreticorum Antesignano tentatus seorsim, oblati quadraginta aureorum millibus, et securâ quocunque vellet emigrandi licentiâ modò urbe excederet, nec ejus deditionem pergeret impedire fortissimè respuit, præeligens Catholicis civibus ad mortem usque assistere, quam hæreticorum Salvo Conductu, auroque fulgere, aut secure deliciari." *Hibernia Dominicana*, p. 488.

The proposal to O'Neill having been thus rejected by that chivalrous soldier, Ireton applied to Fennell who received his overtures favourably. Fennell being well known to Ireton through former treasons, it may seem strange that he did not apply to him in the first instance. But this is easily accounted for. Fennell was a subordinate officer, and could only play the part of an ordinary traitor, in which he might fail as he did at Clonmel; but if O'Neill came into Ireton's views success would be assured, and the affair would stand before the world as a real victory—a regular defeat of O'Neill. In the other way it could bear no such aspect; and hence necessity rather than choice drove Ireton to treat with Fennell.

For some time councils had been divided within the city Ireton knew this, for, of course, he used every means to inform himself of the condition and views of the besieged; so he, Ludlow tells us, "endeavoured by letters and messages to foment the division, declaring against several persons by name that were most active and obstinate for holding out, that they should have no benefit by the articles to be agreed upon, severely inveighing against a generation of men he called soldiers of fortune, that made a trade of war, and valued not the lives or happiness of the people."*

It is not easy to get, with accuracy, at the state of feeling in Limerick from the time Ireton began to draw his forces round it, until it was finally surrendered to him. There was division within its walls, but it was not the ordinary division of citizens into two opposite parties; for there were at least three parties, besides a certain number of persons who were not committed to any of them, agreeing to the views of one party at one time, and the views of another at another. Ormonde, as we have seen, endeavoured to get the command of the city, and to take up his residence there, but the opposition to this proposal was so great that it had to be abandoned. Being the King's representative, people were timid about showing open hostility to him; but openly and covertly the feelings of the great majority of the citizens were clearly manifested against admitting him. They knew his antecedents and they refused to trust him, believing that it would be neither safe nor prudent to give him the com-

* *Memoirs*, pp. 369-70. O'Neill is, no doubt, the chief soldier of fortune alluded to by Ireton. O'Neill had come to Ireland to fight for the land and the religion of his fathers, having, he says elsewhere, resigned an honourable position abroad. It was, therefore, very cool indeed of this pious Puritan rebel (whose name was the ninth signed to the death warrant of his lawful King) to call O'Neill a soldier of fortune, he himself not only being a rebel and a regicide, but pre-eminently a soldier of fortune also.

mand of their city. O'Neill and his northern troops were therefore admitted, and this Ormonde approved of, seeing that he could not get in himself. But all did not unite under O'Neill. He was, to be sure, the military governor; but there was also the civil authority represented by the Mayor, whilst a strong religious influence was exercised by the bishops and priests who were then in the city. And as the reader may remember, these three parties were distinctly represented by the Commissioners who were sent on the first occasion to treat with Ireton. The latter had not, as far as we know, any real supporters or sympathizers within the walls, but as on all such occasions there were persons within them who were willing to shape their course according to their private interests.

The Ormondites would, no doubt, be prepared to repeat in Limerick what Ormonde himself did with regard to Dublin, and make terms with Ireton rather than allow the old Irish Catholic party to come too much to the front. The bishops and priests, with their lives in their hands, stood firmly for the freedom of religion, although Carte most dishonestly accuses them of doing so through their love of power; but they proved their sincerity by suffering everything, even death itself, for the cause to which they were devoted, whilst Ormonde, his matchless hero, took right good care to keep out of harm's way on all dangerous occasions. We know from the accounts which have come down to us, that Major Fennell (Ormonde calls him Colonel Fennell) betrayed the city to Ireton. But he was not a mere isolated traitor; he had sympathisers and was able to win over several influential parties to his views. In fact the city was betrayed by a conspiracy, and not by the act of a single traitor. As far as the names of the conspirators can be ascertained they were for the most part Ormondites, the principal of them being his uncle Dr. Fennell, previously the Marquis's physician and his creature and spy in the Supreme Council. What were the real views of Stritch the Mayor, it is not perhaps very easy to settle. There was a good deal of hesitancy about him, but at any rate there can be no doubt that he aided Fennell in opening the gates for Ireton.*

Whether influenced by the disloyalty of some, or the dreadful mortality resulting from the plague, or by Ireton's overtures,

* Borlase says, that Thomas Strick [or Stritch] the Mayor was of the party that wished to deliver up the city, and that he gave the Key of St. John's Gate to Fennell, though he denied it to the party that opposed the yielding up of the place. *History of the Rebellion of 1641*, p. 358. This is corroborated by Dr. William Layle's account of the transaction, who was eye-witness of what passed, and whose narrative shall be more particularly referred to hereafter.

backed by his "silver-plated bullets," or by all combined, a strong party arose within the walls, favourable to a treaty with the besiegers. "By one come out of Limerick," says the Diary already quoted, "we heard that (the 12th inst.) it was an assembly in the city debated to treat with us ; 2 parts of 3 were for a present treaty, but the rest being, although the fewer, yet the more leading, (countenanced by their factious clergie, and the souldiery) prevailed so as that for 14 daies from that time they should forbear treating, in that time expecting relief."* On the 23rd of October (*before the fortnight agreed upon was expired*), a mixed council of military and civilians was held in the Courthouse of Limerick, at which two points were carried : (1). "That the treaty should go on," and (2) "That they should not sticke [*i.e.* be hindered from proceeding with the treaty] for any persons exempted, or to be exempted from quarter of life or goods."† This was evidently an *ex parte* meeting or cabal, the result of whose deliberations soon became known to the rest of the citizens ; and when the same parties assembled next morning to choose Commissioners for the treaty, "The Lord Bishops of Limerick and Imly, and the clergy there resident, went into the Courthouse and declared unto them the excommunication to be incurred by them and every one of them, if they should deliver up the Prelates to be slaughtered."‡ In spite of this warning they elected agents for the treaty, upon which a declaration of the excommunication upon their persons, and a perpetual interdict upon the city, was published and affixed to the church doors."§

In consequence of this, on that very night, Colonel Fennell, William Burke, Fitzthibott and Lieut.-Colonel Teige McJohn [McShane ?], McTiege and McNamara, with their parties, seized St. John's gate and Cluain's tower, having overcome and dispersed the guard that was regularly appointed to protect those places. Major-General O'Neill, behind whose back all this seems to have been done, appeared on the scene next morning, and questioned Fennell as to his action in the matter, asking

* Diary of Parliamentary Forces ; Aphor. Disc., Vol. III., p. 252.

† Dr. William Layle's Narrative of the Surrender of Limerick, printed in App. of Aphor. Disc., Vol. III., p. 263 ; from the Clarendon Papers in the Bodleian Library. See also Clarendon's Historical Review, p. 204.

‡ Dr. Layle, *loc. cit.*

§ *Ibid.* "The chief authors of the plot were the new Mayor [Stritch], Piers Creagh FitzPiers, Piers Creagh FitzAndrews, the Recorder [Stackpoole], Dr. Dominick White, James Burke, Nicholas Fanning, James White, Alderman, and many Burgesses, whereof Laurence Rice, Laurence White, David Creagh, Stephen White, Patrick Wolfe, and James Mahony were chiefest."—*Ibid.*

him what brought him there at all, seeing that he had been appointed to quite another duty, namely, to relieve the Island's posts. His answer was that "he had reason to be there," that what he had done was by the command of the Mayor, "and the best in the towne." The Mayor was immediately sent for, "but never answered directly to any question," alleging that there was no harm in the said parties being in that place. He was then interrogated as to whether he had given the keys of the gate to them, but "he answered negatively though untruly, as appeared after; this being on Tuesday, the 24th."* On Friday a Council of War sat, which summoned Fennell to come before them, in order to be tried, but he refused to appear, although summoned three or four times. For this contumacy the Council was about to proceed against him, "when upp starts my Lord of Castle-Connell and tooke Fennell's parte." Upon this the Council was dissolved, and Castle-Connell went to Fennell, and had a long private conference with him; after which Fennell, having got four firkins of powder from the Mayor, turned the muzzles of the artillery which was to play upon the enemy, upon the city, and declared he would not give up the position he held, until the city was yielded to Ireton.

On Friday the besiegers planted a battery at the windmill, but so high that it was ineffective. On Saturday they removed their gabions into a lower place, "that they might play sure;" and on Sunday morning about ten o'clock they fired nine great shots, "broke their battery piece,"† and gave a second volley of eight shots, upon which a drummer was sent out to have a time appointed to send Commissioners to

* Ibid.

† *Ibid.* This phrase means, I suppose, that they made a breach in the wall where a battery belonging to the besieged stood.

Ludlow says:—"Our battery being now in order, and the regiments that were appointed to storm, disposed to their several posts, we began to fire; directing all our shot to one particular part of the wall, wherein we made such a breach, that the enemy, not daring to run any farther hazard, beat a parley, and soon came to a resolution to surrender upon the articles we had offered before, delivering up the east-gate of the out-town, which was separated by a river, having a draw-bridge over it, from the other town."—Ludlow's *Memoirs*, Vol. I., p. 372.

Lenihan says:—"The battery was erected against that part of the wall which had no earth lining within, no counter-scarp, no protection, and that weak defence had been also shown to Ireton by some hidden traitor."—*History of Limerick*, p. 178. See also Ludlow, p. 370.

Ireton writes:—"Finding some hopeful advantage for an attempt by way of battery, at a place we had little observed before . . . we at last resolved to try that way, whether it would please God so to work upon their hearts within, as might induce a present surrender before extremity of winter, and so save your sickly army from the hazards and hardships of a winter's siege."—Ireton to Lenthall, 3rd Nov., 1651. *Aphor. Disc.*, Vol. III., p. 265.

treat. The agents from the city went out in the evening with full powers to conclude a treaty, which was accordingly done. It bears the date of the 27th of October, 1651.

The Articles of the Treaty were five in number. The 1st provided for the surrender of the city and the giving of hostages. By the 2nd, All persons (excepting those excepted) were to have quarter for their lives, liberty for their persons and goods, and freedom from pillage, &c. The 3rd Article provided that officers, soldiers, and other persons then in the city, were to have liberty to march away with clothes, bag and baggage, money and goods, to any place within the Dominion of Ireland, not being a garrison of the Parliament; and to have three months' time to remove their goods; and that such as would choose to go to any garrisons or parties of the enemy should be provided with a convoy or safe conduct during their march, at the rate of ten miles a day, and conveyances and provisions from the country, at the usual rates. According to the 4th Article, those who had property or other interests in the city, could get an extension of time for remaining there, by application to the Deputy-General, or the chief officer in command. By the 5th Article it was permitted to all such persons in the city as desired to live peaceably under protection, and submit to the Parliament of England (unless the persons excepted from the benefit of the Articles, and *except all clergymen, Priests, and Friars of any order*) to live in such places within the Dominion as they desired, on obtaining licence and protection.

Such were the principal provisions of the quarter granted by the Articles, with regard to which, however, Dr. Layle makes use of this short and pregnant sentence—"but it was not performed," (!) These words sufficiently indicate the slaughter and villainy that followed.—*See Articles in Lenihan's Limerick, and elsewhere.*

Ireton, as he had threatened, excepted a number of persons from the benefit of the Treaty. They were 22 in all, and are named in the 2nd article in the following order:—1, Major-General Hugh O'Neill, the Governor; 2, Major-General Purcell; 3, Sir Jeffrey Galway; 4, Lieut.-Colonel Lacy; 5, Captain George Walf; 6, Captain Lieutenant Sexton; 7, the Bishop of Limerick; 8, the Bishop of Emly; 9, John Quillin, a Dominican Friar; 10, David Roch, a Dominican Friar; 11, Captain Laurence Welsh, a Priest; 12, Francis Walf,* a Franciscan Friar; 13, Philip O'Dwyer, a Priest; 14, Alderman Dominick

* His name was James, not Francis, but in Latin books his name is set down *Fr. Jacobus Walferus*. *Fr.* [*Frater*] is evidently mistaken for Francis.

Fanning ; 15, Alderman Thomas Stritch ; 16, Alderman Jordan Roch ; 17, Edmund Roch, Burgess ; 18, David Rocheford, Burgess ; 19, Sir Richard Everard ; 20, Doctor Higgins ; 21, Maurice Baggot of Baggotstown ; 22, and Jeffrey Barron.* Three of these exempted persons, namely, the Mayor of the previous year [Fanning], the Bishop of Emly (Terence Albert O'Brien), and Major-General Purcell "were presently hanged and their heads set up on the gates."†

General Purcell did not die like a soldier. He fell on his knees and begged his life, but his prayer was not granted. He was so overcome with fear that he had to be supported to the place of execution by two musketeers. Bruodin styles him "a noble-hearted and most accomplished warrior ;" but this high-flown eulogy was not verified by his career in Ireland. The battle of Rathmines was lost chiefly by his carelessness or incapacity—a battle which, if won, as it could have been, might have changed the whole current of the war in Ireland. His death did not redeem that disgraceful failure.‡

Geoffrey Barron was a Waterford man and a member of the Supreme Council. His heroic and truly Christian behaviour contrasts strongly with Purcell's pusillanimity. When ordered to the gallows, he asked for a short respite to enable him to go to his lodgings. This was granted. On arriving there he broke open his trunks in search of his gayest and richest attire. "Finding a new suit of white taffetie," he clothed himself in it, and returned to the place of execution with the joyous countenance of one about to celebrate his nuptials, and died as became a martyr.§

Father Woulfe, a Dominican friar, was active and enthusiastic in encouraging the citizens to continue their resistance to the Parliamentarians. He was a venerable old man who had filled the office of prior for several years. Having been brought into Court and condemned to death, he made a public profession of Catholic Faith, and exhorted the people to constancy in preserving the religion of their fathers. When he had reached the highest step of the ladder by which he ascended to the gallows, he turned to the spectators and said in a loud and firm voice:—"We have been made a spectacle to God, to angels, and to men :

* Dr. Wm. Layle says there were twenty-four persons exempted from the articles.

† Ireton to Lenthal, 3rd November, 1651.

‡ Ludlow's *Memoirs*, p. 373.

§ Aphor. Disc., Vol. III., p. 20.

to God (would that he may grant it) a spectacle of glory, to angels of joy, to men of contempt."—(1 Cor. iv. 9.) He was then thrown forward and expired.

The Bishop of Emly went with a joyful and dignified bearing to the place of execution, bowing as he proceeded, with a serene countenance to the Catholics, who wept bitterly as he passed. His last words to them were:—"Preserve the Faith, keep the commandments; do not murmur at the will of God and you will possess your souls; do not weep for me, but pray that being firm and unbroken amidst this torment of death, I may happily finish my course."*

We find but meagre accounts of the Puritan soldiers on entering Limerick. Dr. Layle tells us the terms of surrender were not kept, but he gives no details as to how they were broken. The Author of the *Aphor. Disc.* however writes as follows:—"The enemies [were] running here and there, massacre and killing every mother's child they met other than the exempted traitors, three days and so many nights were they in this bloody execution, no growth [grotto], settler, prison, church, or tomb, was unsearched, all therein found, made peace-meals, and hanged and quartered."†

Father Woulfe and Jeffrey Barron were also executed without delay.

The victors found an abundance of warlike stores in Limerick. Perhaps this is not to be wondered at with regard to weapons, which do not diminish by use, but the stock of ammunition was remarkable. Passing over other things, take the two items of powder and match; we find 83 barrels of powder were delivered up and three tons and a half of match for the firelocks. Nor had provisions run low, although intelligence from within led the besiegers to think they had. "But now we find," writes the author of the *Diary of the Forces*, "the stores in the city more than were reported, or more than the owners would before have acknowledged, *and much more than would have consisted with the well-being (if with the being) of our army to sit by it at this season until these should have been consumed.*"‡

When Ireton himself was prepared to enter the city, Hugh O'Neill, as being governor, met him at the gate, where he presented him with the keys of the city, and gave order for the marching out of the soldiers who were not townsmen, according

* O'Heyne quoted in *Hib. Dominicana*, p. 449.

† *Aphor. Disc.*, *loc. cit.* supra.

‡ *Diary of Parliamentary Forces*. App. *Aphor. Disc.*, Vol. III., p. 263. The italics are the author's.

to the articles. They were in number about two thousand five hundred men. As they were marching out two or three of them fell down dead of the plague. Several of them also lay unburied in the church-yard. The Governor waited on the Deputy to show him the stores of arms, ammunition, and provisions, which were sufficient to have lasted near three months longer.* Hugh O'Neill and Jeffrey Barron, as stated above, were condemned to die, but Ireton consented to hear any defence they had to make. O'Neill's defence was (1) that the war had been long on foot before he came over; (2) that he had come upon the invitation of his countrymen, and that he had always demeaned himself as a fair enemy; (3) that the ground of his exception from the articles, that is, his encouraging the citizens to hold out, when there was no hope of relief, was not applicable to him, who had always moved them to a timely surrender;† (4) and that he should therefore enjoy the benefit of the articles, relying on which he had faithfully delivered up the keys of the town, with all the arms, ammunition and provisions, without embezzlement, and his own person also to the Deputy.‡ “But the blood formerly shed at Clonmel, where this Colonel O'Neill was governor, had made such an impression on the Deputy, that his judgment, which was of great weight with the court, moved them a second time to vote him to die, tho' some of us earnestly opposed it, for the reasons before mentioned by himself; and because whatsoever he had been guilty of before had no relation to these Articles, which did not at all exempt him from being called to an account by the Civil Magistrate for the same. The court having passed sentence of death a second time against him, the Deputy, who was now entirely freed from his former manner of adhering to his own opinion, which had been observed to be his greatest infirmity, observing some of the officers to be unsatisfied with this judgment, referred it again to the consideration of the Court, who by their third vote consented to save his life.”§

We would leave the story of the siege of Limerick by Ireton

* Ludlow's Memoirs, Vol. I., p. 372.

† This part of the defence is cautiously worded. O'Neill would not, any more than other good generals, counsel a town to hold out, when there was *no hope of relief*: but this did not contradict the view that the time had not yet come to give up all hopes of relief when Fennell took possession of St. John's Gate and held it for the enemy, admitting 200 red coats through it to help him to do so, and giving them possession of the St. John's gate tower and Price's mill. See Account of Surrender, by Dr. William Layle, *loc. cit.*

‡ Ludlow, p. 374.

§ Ibid., p. 374. It is stated in the Aphor. Discovery, Vol. III., p. 20, that Ireton treated O'Neill from the first with great kindness, telling him he would

but imperfectly told, were we to pass over in silence the important connection the Missionaries of St. Vincent de Paul had with it, three of whom were within the city during the whole time. Several fathers of the congregation of the Mission, or Vincentian fathers, as they are now commonly called, had been in Ireland some years before the siege of Limerick. Five years of war, from 1641 to the peace of 1646, caused religion to be greatly neglected in this country. Those able to bear arms were, one way or another, nearly all engaged in the conflict, and their pastors could give spiritual aid to their flocks only at the peril of their lives. The peace of '46 gave high hopes of a cordial union between the Catholics and Ormonde, and Queen Henrietta, knowing the Irish Catholics were devoted to the King, her husband, and being aware that much spiritual destitution prevailed in this country, requested, according to some writers, the reigning Pontiff, Innocent X., to send some Missionary Priests to Ireland. The same petition was, no doubt, put forward from other quarters, and even before the peace of '46. The Holy Father selected the Congregation of the Mission for the important undertaking. Those fathers were well known to the Pope, for they had been carrying on missions in Rome itself, from the year 1642.* They were at the moment engaged in preparing Spiritual succour for the slaves of Barbary, and Vincent, in obedience to the Holy Father's request, selected for Ireland eight of those originally intended for Barbary, five of them being Irishmen.†

receive no prejudice; but I prefer to follow Ludlow, who was one of the officers who tried O'Neill, and who had no motive to misstate the facts. For some account of the career of Hugh O'Neill see Note B.

* Letter of a Vincentian Father in author's possession.

† Five were Irish according to the Abbé Maynard; but from St. Vincent's letter to the Bishop of Limerick, dated 15th October, 1646, it would appear there were six of the missionaries Irish. He writes:—"My Lord, I have at last the happiness of sending to Ireland eight missionaries; one of them French, the others Irish, and an English lay brother. The first named will take the direction, according to the advice of the late Mr. Skiddy, who, before his death, recommended this course. . . . And would to God, my Lord, that I were worthy to be one of the party. [St. Vincent was 70 years of age then]. God knows with what heart I would go, and with what affection I offer to him this little band, and to yourself, my Lord, my lasting obedience. I most humbly entreat your Lordship to accept it." From St. Vincent's words to the Bishop of Limerick above given,—"I have at last the happiness," &c., it would appear the mission was thought of before the peace of 1646, and this view is strengthened by what Maynard says when attributing the origin of the mission to Queen Henrietta. His words are, "Qui (Henrietta) n'avait jamais cessé d'entretenir des rapports avec les Catholiques Irlandais, et qui voulait profiter, d'un traité secret passé dernièrement entre eux et Charles I^{er}." This secret treaty was made with the Catholics by Glamorgan, and signed the 25th of August, 1645.

Regarding the name Skiddie or Skiddy in the above extract, my valued cor-

On the eve of their departure Vincent assembled them, and addressed them in such touching and simple words as he knew so well how to select. He, in a special manner, exhorted them to be united, because the Spirit of their Divine Master was one of union and peace; and on all occasions to prove themselves obedient children to the Sovereign Pontiff, who was Christ's Vicar on earth. Having received the blessing of their holy founder, they took their departure from Paris about the middle of October, 1646, and proceeded to Nantes. After some unavoidable delay there, they continued their journey to Saint-Nazaire at the mouth of the Loire, where they took passage for Ireland. In due time they arrived at their destination, and divided themselves into two parties; one for the Diocese of Cashel, and the other for that of Limerick, in each of which they immediately opened Missions, which produced the most abundant fruits. The great and holy work went on for some years not only in the towns, but in the villages and rural districts, the people often making long journeys to attend their Missions. And so great was the number of penitents that many had to wait for weeks before they could get an opportunity of confessing to the Missionaries.* And this is borne out by a letter of St. Vincent de Paul himself. Writing on the 10th of May, 1647, to M. Martin, Priest of the Mission of Genoa, he says:—"We have received news from our Missionaries in Ireland. They tell me that the war and the poverty that reigns around are great obstacles to their work; yet having lately given a Mission the crowds were so great that they (although five confessors) were not able to get through all the confessions, as numbers from the surrounding country thronged in at the sound of the Gospel truths. Some living ten leagues away remained four or five days to get to confession. I commend them to your prayers."† "The change of heart was so great and so rapid that the Irish bishops could hardly conceive it. The Nuncio [Rinuccini], whom the Pope had in that kingdom at the time, congratulated the Missionaries on their success. He exhorted them to persevere with the good work, and invited the clergy of the country, Secular and Regular, to follow in their instructions

respondent is of opinion that it is either Sheedy or Sheehy. Sheedy, I should say, is the most probable, but I entertain a strong opinion that the name Skiddy itself exists in the south of Ireland. Father Skiddy was born in Cork in 1609, and entered the Congregation of the Mission 9th October, 1638. *Letter cited above.*

* Mgr. Abelly, Evêque de Rodez: Vie de S. Vincent de Paul, Tome I., p. 410.

† Kindly supplied by Vincentian Father already quoted.

the method of the Missionaries, so easy in practice and so full of benediction in its results.”*

The successes of the Parliamentary army made the giving of missions more and more difficult—at first in the rural districts, but by degrees in the towns also, which, one after another, were taken by the Parliamentarians; so that at last there was no place of importance or security left but Limerick. St. Vincent having been informed of this, called five of the eight Fathers back to France, leaving the other three in the city of Limerick to continue their labours. And indeed it had become a vast field of missionary work from the fact, that great numbers of the rural population rushed, terror-stricken, into the city. The Missionaries who returned to France were the bearers of letters to St. Vincent, from the Archbishop of Cashel and the Bishop of Limerick, testifying to the great success of the missions, and thanking St. Vincent for the valuable spiritual aid he had afforded their flocks. In his letter, the Bishop of Limerick says:—“It is true, the troubles and the armies that are in this kingdom have been a great obstacle to their [the Missionaries’] functions. Yet in spite of this, they have so deeply imprinted what regards God and their salvation on the souls of the inhabitants, in the towns as well as in the country, that they bless God in adversity the same as in prosperity. I hope to save my soul with their assistance.”†

- The three priests who were carrying on the missions in Limerick, not only expressed their willingness, but their strong desire to continue their labours in the doomed and plague-stricken city, and their holy Superior gave them the necessary permission in a letter written from Paris in April, 1650, to the head of the mission at Limerick, in which he says, “We have been greatly edified by your letter, seeing in it two excellent effects of the grace of God; through one of them you have given yourself to God, to remain in a country where you are surrounded with dangers, electing to expose yourself to death in order to help your neighbour; and through the other you consult for the safety of your confreres, by trying to send them back to France, where they will be at a distance from peril. The spirit of martyrdom has urged you to the first, and prudence to the second; both are derived from the example of our Blessed Lord, who being on the point of dying for the salvation of mankind, wished to protect and deliver His disciples: ‘If

* Vie de S. Vincent de Paul, par M. Collet, Tome 4^{ème}, p. 242.

† Saint Vincent de Paul, sa Vie, son Temps, ses Œuvres, son Influence. Par M. L. Abbé Maynard, Chanoine honoraire de Poitiers. Tome 3^{ème}, p. 39.

therefore you seek Me, let these go their way.' (John xviii. 8). . . . Since those other Missionaries who are with you are disposed, like you, to remain notwithstanding the dangers arising out of war and sickness, we think it well for them to do so. Who knows the designs of God? Surely He does not give such a desire in vain." Further on in this letter St. Vincent calls the Mission of his fathers in Ireland, "the most fruitful, and perhaps the most necessary they had ever beheld."

There being no quarter for priests in the Articles of the Treaty of Surrender, the three Vincentian Fathers and a large number of other ecclesiastics then in the city, got out in disguise among the soldiers who were compelled to retire. St. Vincent himself gives an account of this in a letter to Father Lambert, Superior at Varsovia, bearing date 22nd March, 1652. He writes:—"We thought our Irish confreres were amongst those whom the English put to death at the taking of Limerick, but thanks to God, He delivered them out of their hands. That is certain with regard to Father Barry, who has reached Nantes, and whom we expect here. We have hopes of the safety of Father Brin, though we are not sure. They escaped together from Limerick along with one hundred, or one hundred and twenty priests and religious, all in disguise, and mingling with the soldiers of the city, who left the day the enemy entered. Our Missionaries spent the night preparing for death, because no quarter was to be given to ecclesiastics; but God did not permit them to be recognised as such. Having got out, they separated from each other, not without great sorrow, one going this way and another that. Father Brin went towards his home along with the Vicar-General of Cashel, their good friend, and Father Barry made for the mountains, where he fell in with a charitable lady who received him, and kept him two months in her house, until he got his passage in a vessel bound for France. Since he parted with Father Brin he has not heard of him. He thinks it will be difficult for him to reach France, as the English are masters of the sea, and are, besides, in his country, so that he is in need of prayers. The poor cleric Lyé having reached his home, fell into the hands of the enemy, who dashed out his brains and cut off his hands and feet in the presence of his mother."*

No part of the expense incurred in sending the Vincentian Fathers to this country and supporting them here, was borne by the Irish people. Something was given by the Duchess d'Aiguillon, partly to defray the expenses of the voyage, and

* Copy of Letter in Author's possession. According to Abelly Father Brin also arrived safely in France. *Vie de S. Vincent de Paul*, Vol. I., p. 417.

partly to purchase vestments, of which the Fathers were in much need. With the exception of this charitable offering, the parent House of St. Lazare, through the inexhaustible charity of St. Vincent, bore the whole charges of the Irish Mission; but as his biographers remark, over 80,000 general confessions, and others without number, were an ample reward to the Saint for his generous outlay. At the time of the siege there were about 20,000 Catholics in the city of Limerick capable of partaking of Sacraments, and it seems beyond doubt that hardly one of those omitted to make a general confession.* This 20,000 represents the whole number of persons (young children excepted) in the city at the time of the Siege. To us moderns it may, at first sight, seem a small population for Limerick, but we must bear in mind that 20 years later, in 1672, Sir W. Petty estimated the population of Ireland at 1,100,000, and the truth is, a great number of those 20,000, probably one-half, were not belonging to the city at all, the peasantry of the surrounding country having fled into it for protection; and probably the over-crowding thus caused had something to do with the plague, which then manifested itself, and raged so violently, that according to some accounts about 8,000 persons died of it, among whom are to be numbered the Bishop of Limerick's brother, and Ireton himself.†

It is impossible to say at what precise time the idea of reaching the throne took possession of Cromwell, but it must have been pretty early in his career. If not before the battle of Worcester, it was certainly immediately after it. Oliver was a man who looked far a-head, and he soon began to show a desire to

* "Il y avait près de vingt mille communions dans Limerick, qui firent tous leur confession générale."—*Abelly, Vie, &c., Vol. I., p. 412.*

† According to calculations made by Sir Wm. Petty the whole population of Ireland in 1672, (20 years after the end of the war) was only 1,100,000.—*Political Survey of Ireland, 2 Ed., p. 8.*

The Missionaries sent by St. Vincent to Ireland were:—

1. Father Bourdet, Superior of the Mission.
2. Father Duchene.
3. Father Brin.

This, no doubt, was Byrne or O'Byrne, Brin being the usual way of writing Byrne at the time.

4. Father Barry.

5. The Cleric Lyé, who was martyred. There can be scarcely any doubt that he was the Thaddeus Leahy who was born at Tuam in 1623, received into the Congregation in Paris, 21st October, 1643, and had made his vows 7th of October, 1645.

There were two lay brothers belonging to the Mission:—

Brother Soloman, Peter Patriarch (Peter Patriarch were names taken in Confirmation).

Brother Vaugin, who joined the Missionaries from Mans.

stand well with Cavaliers and Roundheads alike, a fact which the latter observed with considerable disfavour. When Ormonde was supposed to wish to leave Ireland on his being refused admission into Limerick, Cromwell offered him a pass through Dean Boyle, to whom he said many kind things about the Marquis and his friends, more especially about the Marchioness. It would be a mistake to imagine that this affair was intended as an insult to Ormonde: no, it was the result of Cromwell's desire to stand well with a man of such position and influence. On the eve of his sailing from Galway, Ireton made Ormonde the same offer.

Oliver would be King of the Nation and not of a section of it.

Clanrickarde had scarcely assumed the Government when Grace and Bryan, two Catholic officers, presented themselves to the Assembly of prelates, with a letter from Axtel, the Puritan Governor of Kilkenny, containing a proposal for a treaty. By many it was hailed with transports of joy, as the conditions held out were better than they had reason to expect *then*, and infinitely better than they could expect afterwards. There was much truth and force in this reasoning; and it was strengthened by the testimony of officers from several quarters, who represented that, to negotiate with the Parliament was the only expedient for the preservation of the people. But Clanrickarde treated the proposal with contempt, regarding it as an insult to himself, and an act of treason against the King. He was seconded by Castlehaven, who affected to despise the enemy's power, and attributed their success to the divisions amongst the royalists. The real traitors in the case were Clanrickarde and Castlehaven! for they had been secretly instructed by Charles *to continue the contest at every risk*, as the best means of enabling him to make head against Cromwell. So that the lives and properties of the Catholics of Ireland were to be sacrificed to the mere chance of gaining a victory for the Scots, the bitter and implacable enemies,* who had insisted on the abolition of their religion throughout the realm.

Some time in the summer before Ormonde left Ireland, he sent Lord Taaffe to Brussels to solicit material aid from the Duke of Lorraine, to sustain the King's interests in Ireland. Lorraine was related to Charles, and moreover, like some modern German dukes, had no objection to venture, *for a consideration*. Taaffe was alarmed at the duke's demands, and proceeded to Paris to get

* Lingard's England, Vol. VIII., pp. 169-70. Castlehaven's Memoirs, pp. 130 l. Castlehaven exults over the fact that he and Clanrickarde caused Grace and Bryan to retire discomfited.

the opinion of the Queen Mother and the Duke of York upon them. They urged him to come to terms with Lorraine, as they believed the royal cause must collapse in Ireland if left unsustained by foreign aid ; and although the duke's demands were somewhat exorbitant, they could not, they thought, be so injurious to the King as the total ruin of his affairs in this country. Still Taaffe feared the responsibility of closing with the duke, and induced him to send Dr. Henin to Ireland as his envoy, with power to conclude a treaty. When Dr. Henin arrived he was received with joy by the people, the clergy, and the nobility. He brought some arms and ammunition, and gave a promise of further support. The Duke, being a Catholic Prince, said he would sustain the cause of religion, as well as that of the King. The Catholics were between two fires, Cromwellians on one side, Scotch Covenanters on the other. "The curse of Cromwell," which had so lately fallen on the land, was terrible enough, but should the Kirk triumph, they believed their state would be still more dreadful, as those who had taken the Covenant were bound to exterminate Catholics wherever they had the power to do so. And the unfortunate and unprincipled Charles himself, having taken the said Covenant, had solemnly engaged to break all treaties with his Irish Catholic subjects, and to destroy them as "bloody rebels," although their blood had been shed in the cause of himself and his father. The Confederate Catholics therefore hailed as a godsend the offer of a powerful and wealthy Prince to stand between them and the destruction which threatened them from both sides.

But Clanrickarde like Taaffe took alarm at the conditions proposed by Dr. Henin on the part of Lorraine. "That Prince, by the treaty, engaged to furnish for the protection of Ireland, all such supplies of arms, money, ammunition, shipping, and provisions, as the necessity of the case might require ; and in return, the agents, in the name of the people and kingdom of Ireland, were to confer on him, his heirs and successors, the title of Protector Royal, together with the chief civil authority, and the command of the forces, but under the obligation of restoring both, on the payment of his expenses to Charles Stuart, the rightful Sovereign."*

After the King's defeat at Worcester, when he had arrived at Paris, he sent the Earl of Norwich to the Duke of Lorraine, to object to the articles of the treaty which bore most on the royal authority. He proposed that the old treaty should be set aside, and that a new one should be prepared, with those articles left out or

* Clanrickarde, p. 34.

greatly modified. But the crushing defeat of the Scots caused Lorraine to regard the whole project as hopeless ; and so it was carried no further. But he was never refunded the £20,000 he had advanced to Clanrickarde. Of the whole affair Lingard says:—" There cannot be a doubt that each party sought to overreach the other."*

On the 12th of May, 1652, Galway surrendered to Sir Charles Coote, before any storm or assault had been attempted, and without consultation with the Lord Deputy, who was within half-a-day's journey of the town. The smaller places that had been holding out in Connaught, quickly followed the example of Galway and made the best terms they could with the Parliamentarians, and so a war of ten years' duration was ended.

* History of England, Vol. VIII., pp. 170-1-2. See Articles between Taaffe and the Duke of Lorraine in Cox, Vol. II., p. 59.

CHAPTER XX.

THE CROMWELLIAN TRANSPLANTATION.

ALTHOUGH the war of 1641 had practically come to a close in May, 1652, as stated in the last Chapter, the Parliament did not declare "the rebellion subdued" and "the war appeased and ended" until the 27th of September, 1653.* And then what a retrospect presented itself! The country had become a blood-stained wilderness, for this war was, like all other English wars in Ireland, a war of extermination to clear the ground for a new England: Every plan that could be devised by hard heads and harder hearts was resorted to for this purpose. The sword, which is the natural weapon of war, was never sheathed; but famine more dreadful than the sword, and so eloquently recommended by the poet, Edmund Spenser, as more effective, was also called into requisition. Prevent husbandry, destroy the cattle and the growing crops, "we can have our supplies from England,"—such was the motto and such the cry. The remedy was very effective. "To place garrisons near their fastnesses, to lay waste the adjacent country, allowing none to inhabit there on pain of death, was the course taken to subdue the Irish.† The consequence was, that the country was reduced to a howling wilderness. In his circuitous march from Waterford to the Siege of Limerick, in November, 1650—a distance, he says, of 150 miles—Ireton passed through districts of 30 miles together, with hardly a house or any living creature to be seen, only ruins and desolation in a plain and pleasant land."‡

The war having been declared at an end, the time had arrived for the Parliament to meet the demands of such as had claims on them. The claimants were of two classes, those who had lent money to carry on the war, and the soldiers who had fought in it. There was but one way by which these claims could be met, which was the confiscation of the entire soil of Ireland, 2,500,000

* Scobell's Acts and Ordinances quoted in the "Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland." By John P. Prendergast, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. This invaluable work will be the chief authority for the facts given in the present chapter.

† "Some particulars humbly offered," &c., quoted in Cromw. Settlement, p. 79.

‡ Mercur. Polit., p. 313, quoted *ibid.*

acres of which had been already mortgaged to the Adventurers for the monies they had advanced. The conduct of the Parliament towards the King had, for a considerable time, been that of "veiled rebellion;" they continued to make professions of loyalty with suspicious exuberance, whilst they were stripping him, one by one, of his prerogatives and powers. To put down the Irish rebellion, Irish lands had been offered to such as were willing to lend money on their security. Those who did so were called subscribers, or Adventurers. Many of them entered into the project with much zeal; for besides the substantial advantage of securing rich land at a low price, they felt they would have eternal rewards from God for the aid they gave towards the uprooting of popery. Many in England began to petition for leave to become subscribers, and the Parliament passed an Act by which, as stated above, 2,500,000 acres of Irish land were offered as security for the money advanced. This money was not paid into the King's exchequer, but was placed in the hands of a committee, one-half of whom were members of the House of Commons, the other half subscribers or Adventurers. A private army was raised for subduing the rebels in Ireland, and the joint committee assumed the right of appointing the general and all the other officers, leaving to the King the empty privilege of signing their commissions. His Majesty objected to this Act, because it placed him in direct antagonism to his Irish subjects, but he was afraid to refuse his assent to it.

The terms on which the Adventurers subscribed their money for the war, were the following:—"They were to have estates and manors of 1,000 acres given to them in Ireland, at the following low rates:—In Ulster for £200, in Connaught for £300, in Munster for £450, and in Leinster for £600, and smaller lots for proportionably less sums. The rates by the acre were four shillings in Ulster, six shillings in Connaught, eight shillings in Munster, and twelve shillings in Leinster. If this plan were carried out, it was to put an end for ever, according to Sir John Bulstrode Whitelock, the Speaker of the House of Commons, to that long and bloody conflict foretold (with so much truth) by Giraldus Cambrensis.* The work of Queen Elizabeth and James the First, it was said, would now be perfected. The Irish would be rooted out by a new and overwhelming plantation of English; another England would speedily

* Speech at a Conference between the Lords and Commons on 13th February, 1641-2, concerning the Proposition of divers gentlemen, &c. See "Cromwellian Settlement," p. 73. 2nd Ed. To save repetitions, I beg to state that this edition is the one quoted in every instance in the present work.

be formed in Ireland, and that prophecy, as old as the invasion,* be proved false, and that Ireland will not be conquered till just before the day of Judgment."† The author of the "Cromwellian Settlement" prints a full list of the Adventurers, with the sums subscribed by them. The number of those who contributed to raise and support land forces for the Irish war was 1,158, the total amount of their subscriptions being £249,305, 19s. 8d.—in round numbers a quarter of a million—a sum not much short of one million sterling, according to the present value of money. The subscriptions for the sea forces were comparatively small, amounting only to £43,406, 5s. advanced by 172 subscribers.‡

In the summer of 1642 the Adventurers had a private army of 5,000 foot and 500 horse under the command of Lord Wharton at Bristol, ready to invade Munster; but the civil war having broken out, the Parliament, which always pretended their only object was to free the King from evil councillors, ordered Lord Wharton to lead this army against him. In a message to the Commons his Majesty represented that no part of the Adventurers' money could be so used, because "by the express words of the Act of Parliament, it was declared *that no part of that money should be employed to any other purpose,*" but the reduction of Ireland, and he therefore called on them to retract their order for applying it to other uses. "The Commissioners in answer declare, that these directions given by his Majesty for retracting their order was *a high breach of the privileges of Parliament.*"§

Lord Wharton therefore by the orders of Parliament marched against the King, but his forces, together with the other English rebels, were defeated at Edgehill on the 23rd of October, 1642. "The Adventurers finding that the funds they had raised to conquer lands in Ireland were thus misused by the Parliament, it was difficult to obtain further subscriptions, though the measure of land was enlarged to the Irish standard, and afterwards doubled for any Adventurer that would pay in a sum equal to a fourth of his original subscription."||

During the whole course of the war the Adventurers were very pressing to have assigned to them the promised lands in Ireland.

* Giraldus Cambrensis, chap. B., 233, quoted in "Cromwellian Settlement," p. 73.

† Fidelity, Valour, and Obedience, &c., &c. By Walter Meredith, Gent., quoted Ibid., p. 74.

‡ Cromwellian Settlement. Appendix, p. 403. This list of Adventurers is preserved in the Record Tower, Dublin Castle, and may be, the author of the "Cromwellian Settlement" thinks, the only complete one in existence.

§ Rushworth's Collections Abridged and Improved, Vol. IV., p. 498.

|| Cromwellian Settlement, p. 74.

At length in May, 1652, the Committee of Parliament offered to move the House to comply with their request, and to allot them lands in Leinster and Munster, if they would fully undertake to plant their proportions within three years from the 29th of September following, *with protestants of any nation (save Irish)*. Although the Adventurers were very anxious to get hold of the lands, they objected to a speedy plantation, because the war was not yet over. The Tories were active and dangerous, and no plan for the security or protection of the planters had been laid down; so they refused to be put under conditions to plant within any limited time. Labourers, they further urged, were scarce in England. A great number would be required for the planting, they had not houses to lodge them in, and "*they dared not build in that land of desolation, till the Tories should be destroyed.*"* It was ultimately arranged that the planting by the Adventurers and the Army should go on simultaneously, each having their distinct lands allotted to them.

The setting out of their lands to the Adventurers and soldiers presented many difficulties, one of which met the Commissioners on the very threshold of the business. It was the existence still in the country of those thousands of trained Irish soldiers, who had laid down their arms under articles, which are known in the histories of the period, as the "Kilkenny Articles." Those soldiers no longer existed as an army, but they existed in the bogs and fastnesses, in bands more or less numerous, and from these natural strongholds it was found impossible to dislodge them. The starving out of the Irish from such places by building castles near them occupied by garrisons was an old piece of English strategy; but such a process, even if successful, would be slow, and ineffective in the present case, because the protection of the planters was of immediate and present necessity. In January, 1652, according to the Report of the Commissioners, the Parliament had an army of 30,000 men in Ireland, but they had 350 garrisons and military posts to maintain, and there were 100 more to be built. The disbanded Irish soldiers numbered as many as the army of the Parliament, the greater number being distributed over the country, living, as I have said, in the bogs and fastnesses, and holding their own as well as they could. There could be no security for the planters, while these unreach-able, impalpable, but very real and dangerously active bands were in existence. They must, therefore, be disposed of somehow, before the English Adventurers and Cromwell's

* Carte Papers, Vol. lxx., p. 235. Cromwellian Settlement, p. 83.

soldiers could enjoy in peace the confiscated soil of Ireland. Hence we have in the Cromwellian Settlement the striking announcement in Capitals—

“DEPARTURE OF THE SWORDSMEN FOR SPAIN;”

Swordsmen meaning, in the case, all trained soldiers. By the Kilkenny Articles the Irish were to be allowed to engage in the service of any state in amity with the Commonwealth. Foreign nations were not ignorant of Irish valour. From the time of the Munster Plantation under Elizabeth, numerous Irish exiles took military service in foreign countries, especially in Spain. Wherever those Irish soldiers fought they made for their countrymen a reputation for valour and endurance, which caused foreign princes to receive them with welcome whenever they stood in need of their services; and agents from the King of Spain, and King of Poland, and the Prince de Conde, were now contending for the services of Irish troops. Many of the chief Irish officers known to fame in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries made their reputation in foreign service. The great Owen Roe O'Neill himself, having left Ireland at the age of ten years, received all his military education fighting under the Spanish flag, chiefly in the Low Countries, then regarded as the military school of Europe.* Between 1651 and 1654 thirty-four thousand (of whom few ever saw their native land again) were transported into foreign parts.†

The next announcement we find “displayed,” (as the printers say,) by large capitals in the “Cromwellian Settlement” is the following:—

* “There lives not a people more hardy, active, and painful neither is there any will endure the miseries of warre, as famine, watching, heat, cold, wet, travel, and the like, so naturally, and with such facility and courage as they [the Irish] do. The Prince of Orange’s Excellency uses often publicly to deliver that the Irish are souldiers the first day of their birth. The famous Henry IV., the King of France, said there would prove no nation so resolute martial men as they, would they be ruly, and not too headstrong. And Sir John Norris was wont to ascribe this particular to that nation above others, that he never beheld so few of any country as of Irish that were idiots and cowards, which is very notable.”—p. 219, “Advertisement for Ireland.” MS. folio (A.D. 1615.) Library of Trin. Coll., Dublin, E. 3, 16.

“Henry IV. of France publicly called Hugh O’Neill the third soldier of the age, meaning himself to be the first, and the illustrious C. de Fuentes the second; as testified to this day by the Most Noble the Count D’Ossunia, late Viceroy of Naples and Sicily, and in whose presence he said so.”—Lynch’s “Alithinilogia,” Vol. II., p. 50. Quoted in “Cromwellian Settlement,” p. 87.

† Sir William Petty’s “Political Anatomy” makes the number 40,000 up to 1672.

THE SEIZURE OF WIDOWS, GIRLS, AND ORPHANS, TO SEND TO THE BARBADOES.

The Swordsmen were dangerous to the planters. Widows, orphans, and "those who had no visible means of livelihood" were an incumbrance; so that whilst the gentry of Ireland were being transported to Connaught, and the swordsmen shipped for Spain, "Agents were actively employed through Ireland seizing women, orphans, and the destitute, to be transported to Barbadoes, and the English colonies in America." For this inhuman wickedness the Government took great credit to themselves, because they relieved the planters of a population that was useless and might be troublesome; and the benefit to those who were transported and enslaved was also very great, for they were consigned to the tender mercy of West India sugar planters, where they might be *made English and Christians*, and where the enforced labour of those able to work would be serviceable to their taskmasters!* The forty thousand swordsmen who went to Spain, and the soldiers who died fighting for their religion and country in the war, left a great number of widows and orphans behind them, and it became a business with the merchants of Bristol (then the great English port) to send agents through the country to treat with the government for men, women, and young girls to be sent to the sugar plantations of the West Indies. The Commissioners for Ireland having arranged terms with those agents, "gave them orders on the governors of garrisons to deliver to them prisoners of war; upon the keepers of jails, for offenders in custody; upon masters of workhouses for the destitute in their care: . . . and gave directions to all in authority to seize those who had no visible means of livelihood, and deliver them to those agents of the Bristol sugar merchants; in execution of which latter direction Ireland must have exhibited scenes in every part *like the slave hunts in America*." They are unrecorded, but may be well imagined. One case has come down to us in Morison's "Threnodia." It is as follows:—"Daniel Connery, a gentleman of Clare, was sentenced, in Morison's presence, to banishment, in 1657, by Colonel Henry Ingoldsby, for harbouring a priest. This gentleman had a wife and twelve children. His wife fell sick, and died in poverty. Three of his daughters, beautiful girls, were transported to the West Indies, to an Island called the Barbadoes; and there, if still alive, (he says) they are miser-

* "Cromwellian Settlement," p. 89, et seq. Letter of Henry Cromwell, 4th Thurloe's State Papers.

able slaves.”* “But at last the evil became too shocking and notorious, particularly when these dealers in Irish flesh began to seize the daughters and children of the English themselves, and to force them on board their slave ships; then, indeed, the orders, at the end of four years, were revoked.†

On the 26th of September, 1653, the Parliament passed an Act for the new planting of Ireland. English Episcopalianism, and the offices connected with it, were abolished. The Government reserved for themselves the Church lands and tithes, together with all towns. They also reserved for themselves the four counties of Dublin, Kildare, Carlow, and Cork. This very large reservation was declared necessary to pay public debts, and to reward eminent friends of the republican cause in Parliament; it was required also to enrich private favourites, active English rebels, regicides, and other such patriots. At the time the Act was passed the amount due to the Adventurers was £360,000. This sum the Government divided into three lots: £110,000 was to be satisfied in Munster; £205,000 in Leinster, and £45,000 in Ulster. Ten counties were charged with their payment:—Waterford, Limerick, and Tipperary, in Munster; Meath, Westmeath, King’s and Queen’s Counties, in Leinster; and Antrim, Down, and Armagh, in Ulster. Then came the division by lots, according to the Act. The Lottery was held in Grocers’ Hall, London. There were three drawings. The first determined in which province the Adventurer’s claim was to be satisfied. The second determined in which county the Adventurer was to receive his land; and as it had been considered an encouragement, and, in fact, a necessary protection to the Adventurers, to have soldier planters near them, arrangements were made for this purpose. The counties above named were divided into baronies, when a third drawing was made at the same time for Adventurers and soldiers, some officer being appointed to represent the latter; and the matter was so managed that baronies were not to be divided. One barony was to consist exclusively of Adventurers, another exclusively of soldier-planters. All the soldiers, however, were not planted in this way; so “the rest of Ireland, except Connaught, was to be set out amongst the officers and remaining soldiers, for their arrears, amounting to £1,550,000, and to satisfy debts of money or provisions due for supplies advanced to the army of the Commonwealth, amounting to £1,750,000. Connaught was, by the Parliament, reserved and appointed for the habitation of the

* Morison’s *Threnodia Hiberno-Catholica*. Innsbruck, 1659, p. 257. Quoted in *Cromwellian Settlement*, p. 90.

† *Ibid.*

Irish nation; and all English Protestants having lands there, who should desire to remove out of Connaught into the provinces inhabited by the English, were to receive estates in the English parts of equal value in exchange.”*

By the Act of the 26th of September, 1653, “all the ancient estates and farms of the people of Ireland were declared to belong to the Adventurers and the army of England; and it was announced that the Parliament had assigned Connaught (America was not then accessible), for the habitation of the Irish nation, whither they must transplant with their wives, and daughters, and children, before the 1st of May following (1654), under penalty of death, if found on this side of the Shannon after that day.” Many of the nobility, gentry, and leading proprietors, influenced by caution and prudence, refrained from taking any active part in the war, yet it was they who were specially compelled to transplant, not because they could be accused of having taken part in the so-called Massacre of 1641, but *because their properties were required for the new English planters*. Ploughmen, labourers, and such others as were useful for husbandry, were excepted from transplantation, although they would be far more likely than the wealthy classes to be concerned in the massacre, had there been one. Three reasons are given for this arrangement: “There is,” says the author of the “Cromwellian Settlement,” “an anecdote told by an English monk of the Order of the Friars Minors, who must have dwelt disguised, probably (a not uncommon incident), as a soldier or servant, in the household of Colonel Ingoldsby, Governor of Limerick, that explains the reason why the common people were to be allowed to stay, and the gentry required to transplant. He heard the question asked of a great Protestant statesman (*‘magnus hereticus Consiliarius,’*) who gave three reasons for it:—First, he said they are useful to the English as earth tillers and herdsmen; secondly, *deprived of their priests and gentry*, and living among the English, it is hoped they will become Protestants; and thirdly, the gentry without their aid must work for themselves and their families; and so, in time, turn into common peasants, or die if they don’t.”†

We have unimpeachable testimony that punishment for the blood, falsely said to have been shed in 1641, was not the object of the transplantation, and in fact, could not be, because it would

* Scobell's Acts and Ordinances for the year 1653, Chap. 12. “Cromwellian Settlement,” p. 94, et seq.

† Threnodia Hiberno-Catholica, p. 25. Quoted in “Cromwellian Settlement,” p. 98.

be inadequate punishment for such a capital crime. "Gookin having remarked upon the anomaly of transplanting those who could not be conceived guilty of murders, and allowing the class most capable of them to stay, Colonel Lawrence in answer appeals to the Act and Orders for transplantation, and asks, 'Is there in all this one word tending to ground transplantation on the principles of punishment or avenging of blood?' Its end, he said, was *to settle Ireland for the future.*"*

"The Parliament in 1652 confiscated the *whole* of Ireland; but they allotted Connaught to the Irish, in order that the new English might plant and inhabit the three other provinces in security. All the Irish (according to the original scheme of the Parliament), except those *who had adopted the religion of the English nation*, were to transplant thither, on the presumption that they did not love the English. Such of them only were to be permitted to return back to their former homes and lands as could prove a *Constant Good Affection* to the enemy of their religion, name and nation, during the ten years' war just ended."† And a decree to this effect must be obtained from a court of English judges, then sitting in Athlone, to inquire into, critically investigate, and decide upon the evidence put forward by the Irish in proof of this Constant Good Affection. "I appeal to those who knew the condition of Ireland in those times," says Vincent Gookin, "whether these instructions adhered to would not transplant every man? How was it possible to escape compliance when the English were hemmed into their very gates, and the whole country a wild road for the rebels."‡

The two principal reasons for selecting Connaught for the habitation of the Irish nation were: (1.) it was the most barren and the most wasted of the four provinces, the younger Coote having swept over it like a tornado, making it a land of desolation; and (2.) it was to be their prison as well as their residence, an object not concealed, but very distinctly put forward. Whoever will take the trouble to glance over the map of the province will see that it is surrounded by the sea and the Shannon, except some ten miles at Jamestown, easily defended by a few forts; and in fact, the Order of the 9th of March, 1654-5, commands that "the passes between Jamestown and Sligo be closed, so as to make one entire line between Connaught and the adjacent

* Lawrence's "Interest of England in the Transplantation Stated," p. 11, [printed A.D. 1656].

† "Cromwellian Settlement," p. 99, et seq.

‡ Quoted, Cromwellian Settlement, p. 100.

parts of Leinster and Ulster.”* “And further, to secure the imprisonment of the nation, and to cut them off from relief by sea, a belt four miles wide, commencing one mile to the west of Sligo, and so winging along the coast and Shannon, was reserved by the Act of 27th September, 1653, from being set out to the Irish, and was to be given to the soldiery to plant.” Thus, they were within a military cordon. “Thither all the Irish were to remove at latest by the first day of May, 1654, *except Irish women married to English Protestants before the 2nd December, 1650, provided they became Protestants*; except also boys under fourteen and girls under twelve, in Protestant service, *and to be brought up Protestants*; and lastly, those who had shown during the ten years’ war in Ireland their *Constant Good Affection* to the Parliament of England in preference to the King. There they were to dwell without entering a walled town, or coming within five miles of the same, on pain of death. All were to remove thither by the 1st of May, 1654, at latest, under pain of being put to death by sentence of a court of military officers, if found, after that date, on the English side of the Shannon.”†

In spite of the power and anxious desire which existed to put the Irish nation under lock and key in Connaught,‡ great difficulties presented themselves in carrying out the project. Orders were issued dated the 15th of October, 1653, by which fathers and heads of families were to proceed before the 30th January, 1654, to Loughrea, to Commissioners appointed to set them out lands according to the stock possessed by them, and the friends who were to transplant with them. They were there to build huts before the arrival of their wives and families, who were to follow before the 1st of May. “The whole nation, panic struck at having to travel during the winter to Connaught, and to abandon the lands they were still in occupation of, were deprived of all motive to go on with their tillage. The country must next year be a waste, for the soldiers could not be put in

* Ibid. It was by those passes Coote entered Connaught in June, 1651. The Shannon divides Leitrim into two parts, one of which is the Connaught side of the river, but this was of little or no importance.

† “The further Instruction confirmed by this Act.” Ibid, p. 102.

‡ The phrase “lock and key” is no figure of speech: “How strict was the imprisonment of the transplanted in Connaught may be judged, when it required a special order for Lord Trimbleston, Sir Richard Barnewall, Mr. Patrick Netterville, and others, then dwelling in the suburbs of Athlone, on the Connaught side, to pass and repass the bridge into the part of the town on the Leinster side, on their business, and only on giving security not to pass without the line of the town, without special leave of the governor.” Cromwellian Settlement, p. 110. $\frac{A}{p}$ 346.

possession in time to sow.”* Then if numbers of the people refused to obey the order, risking any penalty, even death itself, to transplantation, what was to be done? The Commissioners for Ireland were overwhelmed with a sense of those difficulties, and of their own unworthiness for so great a service; but being spiritual men, they knew where to seek strength and consolation; so they turned to the God of all mercy and charity to vouchsafe them His assistance. “They fasted and enjoined the same thing on all Christian friends in Ireland, and invited the commanders and officers of the army to join them in lifting up prayers with strong crying and tears to Him, to whom nothing is too hard, that His servants, whom he had called forth in this day to act in these great transactions, might be made faithful, and carried on by His own outstretched arm against all opposition and difficulty, to do what was pleasing in His sight.”†

Whether the officers and commanders joined in the fasting and praying or not, they were certainly loud and urgent in demanding their share of the lands of the disinherited Irish. “But the cruellest act of those rough soldiers was that they and the State tenants entered, and proceeded, without mercy, to turn out the wives and children of these transplanted proprietors and their servants, engaged in watching their last crop, without giving them even a cabin to shelter in, or allowing them grass for their cows on lands so lately their own.”‡

The Commissioners were literally overwhelmed with applications from persons anxious to be excused from transplantation. The reasons given were various, and in several instances curious. Old age and infirmity were a common excuse, as it was next to impossible for the old and infirm to travel on foot into Connaught in mid-winter, and cruel treatment it was to ask them. On a memorable occasion a Sacred Personage said to His people:—“Pray that your flight be not in winter, or on the Sabbath,” but the flight of the poor transplanted Irish was in the winter, and, no doubt, on many a Sabbath also. Some service, or supposed service rendered to the army of the Parliament was frequently urged; and a change from Popery to Protestantism was, of course, always deemed a very solid plea for exemption. I select a few cases: “Margaret Barnewall had long been troubled with a shaking palsy.” “Mr. Robinson was aged about

* Cromwellian Settlement, p. 102.

† “Letter dated 9th November, 1653, from the Commissioners for Ireland to the Commanders of the respective precincts to be communicated to the rest of our Christian friends there.” *A*, p. 555. Cromwellian Settlement, p. 103.

‡ Cromwellian Settlement, p. 109. See also letter quoted at foot.

ninety, and blind, and never in arms (as was alledged), and had eighteen plough lands set out to the soldiery." "Piers Creagh, of Limerick, was hated by his countrymen for his former known inclination to the English Government." "Philip Ro O'Hugh [O'Neill] had given intelligence of Sir Phelim O'Neill, whereby he was apprehended and brought to justice." "Mary Thorpe, a Protestant, the wife of Dillon, an Irish Papist, and transportable for her husband's recusancy, being a person fearing God, and affecting his worship in his ordinances, that she might have better conveniency for hearing the Gospel preached," sought exemption. "James Bower, of Waterford, because the Lord hath been pleased to enlighten his heart to the true way of salvation, the Protestant religion, and therefore desirous to live among the English where he might have the real exercise of his religion," made a like request.*

But it was next to impossible to get a dispensation from being transplanted. "William Spenser, the grandson of Edmund Spenser, the author of the 'Faery Queen,' was transplanted as an 'Irish Papist.' His grandfather (as Cromwell wrote to the Commissioners for the Affairs of Ireland) was that Spenser who, by his writings, touching the reduction of the Irish to civility, brought upon him the odium of that nation. . . . William Spenser appealed to Cromwell; and Cromwell, out of regard for the works of Edmund Spenser, endeavoured, but in vain, to save his lands for him."† Spenser even pleaded that since he had arrived at the years of discretion he had utterly renounced Popery. And then the legal queries sent to the Commissioners for Ireland by the Loughrea Commissioners were many and perplexing. For instance:—"Whether persons enlisted by their landlords, being officers, though they were never in the field nor marched out of the country were transplantable?" "Whether Papists that first served in the rebel army, but then took service under the Commonwealth, if still on muster, were transplantable?" "Whether the wives and children of those gone to Spain were transplantable?" "What do the Commissioners for Ireland mean by Irish widows of English extract?" "Whether men marrying transplantable widows become themselves transplantable?"‡

* Cromwellian Settlement, p. 110, et seq., where many more such applications may be seen.

† Ibid., p. 116. See Cromwell's letter in a footnote.

‡ In due time answers were returned to the above queries and others of the like sort. The wives and children of the swordsmen gone to Spain, and the orphans of transplantable persons, and men marrying transplantable persons, became themselves transplantable. But all such "Swordsmen and Proprietors"

Such a multiplicity of petitions were sent in for extension of time, that on the 17th of May, 1654, the Council appointed two sets of Commissioners to hear applications and to grant dispensations. Their instructions were:—"To dispense those whose lives would be endangered—the sick, the aged, the lame, and impotent; those that aided the English armies, that had discovered rebels, that had sheltered English and Protestants from being murdered, and those that should give evidence of renouncing the Popish superstition, and the Bishop of Rome, and should also manifest their desire to hear such as should instruct them in the true and saving knowledge of Jesus Christ and his Gospel and Truths."*

The wholesale eviction of the Irish Nation under circumstances of heartless barbarity must wound the heart of any one who reads through the sickening narrative, but after the toilsome task, the reader feeling that, at last, he can breathe a little freely, will be inclined to ask, will a settlement on the miserable barren lands, doled out to them in Connaught, put a term to the danger and sorrows to which they were so long exposed, even if still the victims of poverty and suffering? Unfortunately, an affirmative reply cannot be assumed as to the state of the disinherited Papists in Connaught. For, writes the author of the Cromwellian Settlement, "The transplanter's trials had only begun when he reached Connaught. The officers employed had to be bribed by money, if the poor transplanter had any money left, if not, by a secret agreement to give the officers part of the land for laying out the rest, as some relief to him and his starving family. The Cootes, the Kings, the Binghamms, the Coles, the St. Georges, the Ormsbys, the Gores, the Lloyds, having thus defrauded transplanters of part of their lots, bought up the remnant at two shillings and six pence, and three shillings per acre, and at the utmost five shillings."†

A ten years' war and the transplantation to Connaught had made all but a desert of the other three Provinces, and the few inhabitants who remained in them, by sufferance or as outlaws, were

"as by two Justices of the Peace were certified to have really renounced Popery, and for six months past had constantly resorted to Protestant worship, were, on giving security to transplant by the 12th of April following, to be set at liberty." That is, set at liberty out of jail, for, at the time, the jails were crowded with persons who, under one excuse or another, had refused to transplant. *Cromwellian Settlement*, p. 131.

* Printed Declaration of 27th March, 1654, *A*, p. 263. *Cromwellian Settlement*, p. 123.

† *Cromwellian Settlement*, p. 151, and authorities there quoted.

dying of starvation, so that in reading the harrowing accounts of the period we are forcibly reminded of the sufferings of the famine-stricken people after the wars of Hugh O'Neill, as described by Fynes Moryson.* "In the years 1652 and 1653, the plague and famine had swept away whole countries, so that a man might travel twenty or thirty miles and not see a living creature. Man, beast and bird were all dead, or had quit those desolate plains. The troopers would tell stories of the place where they saw a smoke, it was so rare to see either smoke by day, or fire or candle by night."†

But those who, in their charitable anxiety, were determined to complete their task of teaching us the "English civility and religion," regarded the work as still incomplete, and hence one of them expressed himself as follows:—"We have three beasts to destroy (said Major Morgan) that lay burthens upon us. The first is the wolf, on whom we lay five pounds a head if a dog, and ten pounds if a bitch. The second beast is a priest, on whose head we lay ten pounds—if he be eminent, more. The third beast is a tory, on whose head, if he be a public tory, we lay twenty pounds; and forty shillings on a private tory."‡

Wolves had increased enormously during the war, for they had dead bodies to feed upon, and few had time to kill or hunt them. They increased still more after the war, for the Swordsmen who went to Spain, proud of their noble wolf dogs, in their affection, brought them into exile with them. When the government officials found they were doing so, they directed the tidewaiters at the different ports to seize the dogs, and send them to the huntsman of the precinct, that they might be used to aid in destroying the wolves, in the public hunts organised for the purpose. The readers of English histories of Ireland cannot have failed to remark that in them, with the exception of Lingard's, every wickedness and misfortune is laid at the door of the priests by the unscrupulous writers, but the following charge by one of them appears to have been conceived and wrought out with special ingenuity: "This curse [the increase of wolves], one of the consequences of the great desolation, the government charged upon the priests. For if the priests had not been in Ireland, the troubles would not have arisen, nor the English have

* History of Ireland. By Fynes Moryson, Secretary to Lord Mountjoy, Lord Deputy; from 1599 to 1603.—Dublin Ed., 1735, Vol. II., p. 232.

† Cromwellian Settlement, p. 307.

‡ "Burton's Parliamentary Diary," 10th June, 1657. Quoted in Cromwellian Settlement, p. 308.

come, nor have made the country almost a ruinous heap, nor would the wolves have so increased."*

The second burthensome beast was the priest. The Irish leaders always put forward freedom of religion as their first, or one of their first demands. It was always met by a curt decided negative. The English House of Parliament, in answer to this demand, passed a joint declaration in December, 1641, that they never could give their assent to any toleration of the Popish religion in Ireland, or in any other of his Majesty's dominions, and Cromwell in answer to the Acts of the Popish clergy at Clonmacnoise said that where the Parliament had power "the Mass should not be allowed of." The priest was always an outlaw. Pym boasted that they would not leave a priest in Ireland. "When any forces surrendered upon terms, *priests were always excepted*; priests were thenceforth out of protection, to be treated as enemies that had not surrendered. Twenty pounds were offered for their discovery, and to harbour them was death."† Yet, they faced all this, remaining in the country for the salvation of souls, in daily and hourly expectation of martyrdom, and when they received the martyr's crown, others pressed forward with a holy emulation to seek the same; "for they spare not," says their enemy Edmund Spenser, "to come out of Spaine and Rome, and from Remes, by long toyle and daungerous travayling hither, where they know perill of death awaiteth them, and no reward or richesse is to be found, only to draw the people unto the Church of Rome; whereas some of our idle Ministers, having a way for credite and estimation thereby opened unto them, and having the livings of the country offered unto them, without paines, and without perill, will neither for the same, nor any love of God, nor zeale for religion, nor for all the good they may doe, by winning soules to God, bee drawne foorth from their warme neastes, to looke out into God's harvest."‡

* Declaration of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland [Cromwell] in answer to the Declaration of the Irish Prelates and clergy in a Conventicle at Clonmacnoise. Printed at Corke, and now reprinted at London.—Ed. Griffin at the Old Bayley, March 21st, 1650.

By a similar process of reasoning it is proved that it is the Irish that have caused the ruin, the plundering, and desolation of the country, from the days of the first invasion, for so many ages.—See Cromwellian Settlement, p. 310. The most curious evidence of the number of wolves at this time is, that lands lying only nine miles north of Dublin were leased by the State in 1653, under conditions of keeping a hunting establishment, with a pack of wolf hounds for killing the wolves, part of the rent to be discounted in wolves' heads. Under this lease, Captain Edward Piers was to have all the State lands in the barony of Dunboyne, in the Co. of Meath.—*Ibid.*, p. 311.

† Several Proceedings in Parliament from 21st to 28th November, 1650.

‡ View of the State of Ireland, p. 254. Dublin reprint, 1809.

Of all the tenets of the Catholic Church, the Mass most excited the fury of her enemies in this country. Cromwell fearing his indiscriminate and indefensible slaughter of the people of Drogheda might give displeasure at headquarters, indirectly makes the saying of Mass in the town the apology for it. Hence in his second letter to Speaker Lenthal, he says,—“It is remarkable that they had ‘set up’ the Mass in Drogheda, and had even ‘a public Mass in a place called St. Peter’s;’” and to show what swift retribution overtook them for such wickedness, he adds, “and in this very place near one thousand of them was put to the sword.”* “The setting up” of the Mass is evidently put forward as a sufficient justification of the savage butchery. If the fact of having said Mass could not be proved against a priest, the authorities often contented themselves with casting him into prison. “George Montgomery, the Protestant Bishop of Derry and Raphoe, in a letter to Sir Arthur Chichester, speaks of two friars thus:—‘The friar O’Mulerky had been straggling (he says) contrary to his (Montgomery’s) caveat and his promise, and is fallen into Captain Philip’s hands at Coleraine. It would not be good to enlarge him hastily. The other friar, Prior O’Loon, imprisoned there for saying a Mass, and enlarged by Chichester’s warrant in hopes of his conformity, he (Montgomery) had thus far prevailed with, that he was contented to forbear for ever afterwards from saying of Masses upon pain of being hanged, if it should be proved against him.’”†

The priests had no fear of being betrayed by their own people for any amount of money, but their enemies, more especially the professional priest-hunters (for in those days priest-hunting was a profession and a lucrative one), discovered the places of their concealment by various devices. A very common one was to track Catholics whom they observed leaving home quietly, with more or less appearance of being prepared for a journey, guessing they would be proceeding to the hiding-place of some priest to receive his ministrations. It was in this way the martyr-bishop of Down and Connor, Cornelius O’Devany, fell into the hands of his enemies. Passing themselves off as Catholics was another trick of the priest-hunters for getting at their prey. So far were the Catholics from betraying their priests, that they often risked their lives in their defence.

“On the 8th of May, 1653, Richard and Thomas Tuite, Edmund and George Barnwall and William Fitzsimons, all names belong-

* See *ante*, p. 332.

† Most Rev. Dr. Moran’s Introduction to Rothe’s *Analecta* (new Ed.), Preface, p. cl.

ing to what would be now called the Catholic gentry, maintained the castle of Baltrasna, in the county of Meath, in defence and rescue of a priest, supposed to have repaired thither to say Mass. For this they were arrested and their goods seized. To these Cornet Greatrex and his soldiers laid claim, on the ground of a forcible entry of the said castle, kept against them with arms and ammunition by such, who maintained a priest in his *idolatrous* worship, in opposition to the declaration of the State in that behalf.*

Writing to the Secretary of the Council in England on the 11th of May, 1610, the Lord Deputy (Chichester) remarks that the hearts of all the faithful subjects "are already sad and heavy at the abuse and liberty of the priests and people in the exercise of their religion, from which they cannot restrain them without slaughter or the gallows, for which they have neither law nor warrant." He further says that his agents lately apprehended a priest "by disguising themselves as he was saying Mass at Multifarnham in Westmeath; and as they were carrying him before a justice of the peace, the country rose, and rescued him from the parties employed and hurt them in sundry places, notwithstanding they showed them his (the Lord Deputy's) warrant, and told them he was a proclaimed traitor."† A few days later he again writes to the same praying for "a commission for the adjudging and execution of pirates and priests, who vex and disturb the kingdom more than can be understood by others than them that feel it."‡

The daring devotion of the people to their priests was astonishing; and after all this hatred of the Mass and priest-hunting it may surprise the reader to learn that "During the whole time the Archbishop [O'Doveany] was in prison he almost daily said Mass, making use of vestments secretly conveyed into the prison by some Catholics."§ The priests being harboured and protected by the people at all risks, it was considered necessary to use severer measures. So the Government, "on the 6th of January, 1652-3, by Declaration introduced the sanguinary English Statute, 27th Elizabeth (A.D. 1585), and declared all

* Cromw. Settlement, *A*, p. 45; *ib.*, pp. 65, 67.

† Calendar of State Papers (Ireland), Vol. II., p. 445.

‡ *Ib.*, p. 473.

§ Compendious History of the Martyrdom of the Rt. Rev. F. Cornelius O'Doveany of the Order of Friars Minors, Bishop of Down and Connor, and of his Chaplain, extracted from the letters sent from Ireland to the Irish Friar Minors in Louvain. In Burgundian Library at Brussels, MS. 2167, p. 421.

Roman Catholic Priests to be guilty of high treason, and their relievers felons."* "Yet still in all parts of the nation there was found a succession of these intrepid soldiers of religion to perform their sworn duties, meeting the relics of their flocks in old raths, under trees, and in ruined chapels, or secretly administering to individuals in the very houses of their oppressors, and in the ranks of their armies."†

I must pass on from this subject, for want of space prevents me from treating it more fully. But briefly, as the heroism and suffering of Irish priests are treated here, I have no doubt they will remind many readers of St. Paul's account of his labours and persecutions. Thus writes the great Apostle of the Gentiles to the Corinthians: "Of the Jews five times did I receive forty stripes, save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once I was stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I was in the depths of the sea; in journeys often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils from my own nation, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils from false brethren; in labour and painfulness, in much watching, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness."‡

The third burthensome beast was the outlaw or Tory. This word "Tory" appears for the first time officially in a proclamation issued by Ormonde, dated 24th of May, 1650, in which he orders all these loose and ill-disposed persons that pillage the protected inhabitants of Leinster, and will not submit to any commands, living upon the people of the country, and that are termed Toryes or Idle Boys to enlist in his Majesty's army, or be deemed traitors.§ But the word Tory, (signifying outlaw,) existed among the people, the class of persons to whom it was by degrees applied having come into existence at the time of the plantation of Munster by Elizabeth, being the owners or the representatives of the owners of the confiscated lands.|| The bands

* "Order for banishing Priests," signed CHARLES FLEETWOOD, EDMUND LUDLOW, MILES CORBET, JOHN JONES.

† Cromw. Settlement, p. 325.

‡ II. Cor. c. xi., vv. 24 *et seq.*

§ Carte Papers, Vol. clxii.

|| The derivation of the word Tory has exercised linguists a good deal. 1. One of the words given as its root is *tora*, from the Irish verb *tabair*, to give; but there is no letter *o* in this verb, and it has been wrongly imported into *tora*. The sound of *b* in it approaches very nearly to the English sound of *w*, so that its pronunciation may be written *tawur*, giving a sound somewhat removed from *tora*, and therefore from *Tory*. In my opinion therefore, *tabair* is not the root of *Tory*. 2. *Taob-righ*—the King's party, is a compound word

of Tories in the woods and bogs were constantly recruited by the dispossessed natives, who preferred taking their chance with them to transplantation, many also joined them to avoid transportation to the Barbadoes, where they must become the slaves of the planters; and even some of the swordsmen clung to home rather than go to Spain. Thus strengthened from various sources the Tories became a terror to the English settlers, and holding their ground in their fastnesses, they, as opportunity served, "fell down like wolves on the usurpers of their homes and country."* "The Parliament had for ages made the killing of an Irishman no murder, and the taking his lands no robbery. Yet this retribution of the Tories on the Cromwellians was, of course, always called outrage and murder; and for their preys they were called robbers. As such they were solemnly hanged . . . Here it was not the big thieves leading the little thieves, but the plunderers leading the plundered to the gallows."† "In 1647, war was still raging, and incursions

from which some derive Tory. This derivation has more in its favour than the former; the pronunciation of it comes pretty near that of Tory, and, as is well known, the people known as Tories in Ireland were opposed to the Parliamentarians and in favour of the King. Still, such a respectable phrase as "the King's party" would scarcely be applied to those who were regarded as robbers and murderers of the deepest dye, and to destroy whom was a service as acceptable to the state as the hanging of priests or the shooting of wolves. The late Archbishop Trench gives a definition of Tories which is somewhat curious. He says: "Tories was a name properly belonging to the Irish bogtrotters who, during the Civil Wars, robbed and plundered, professing to be in arms for the maintenance of the Royal cause." His Grace, I think, spoils his definition by the use of the contemptuous word "bogtrotter," and makes it incorrect besides. Surely, sometime or another, his nurse must have said or sung to him:—

"I'll tell you a story about John Magory—
He went to the *wood* and killed a Tory;
I'll tell you another about his brother—
He went to the *wood* and killed another."

But according to the Archbishop, the excellent brothers Magory could not accomplish their pious design of killing Tories, by going to a wood, as they were to be found in the bogs only.

Not to weary the reader, I come to what seems to me the most probable root of the word Tory. De Foe derives it from the verb *toruig*—to pursue, from the habit (he says) of Tories to make sudden raids. I agree as to the root, but dissent from the explanation, because to pursue (the meaning of the word) is quite different from making a raid. The Irish noun for pursuit is *toir*, and I have many times heard the hurried warning given—*ta an toir ort*—"the pursuit is upon you," and always to persons who, if caught, would be punished; a further phrase with the same meaning is, *Amachgobraith leat, ta an toir ort*, which may be translated, "Run for your life, the pursuit is upon you." Now, as Tory hunting was, as somebody has written, "a favourite pastime in Ireland," I think Tory is derived from the above word, not because Tories made sudden raids, but because they were hunted by persons who made sudden raids upon them.

* Cromw. Settlement, p. 332.

† Cromw. Settlement, p. 333.

were made into the Irish quarters by the English, and into the English quarters by the Irish, and cattle carried off by each side. This Colonel Michael Jones, Governor of Dublin, declared could not be by the Irish unless by the connivance of their kindred and friends, and tenants living protected within the English quarters. He accordingly issued his Declaration (of 2nd November, 1647), making the Irish in the English quarters responsible for the outrages committed on the persons, goods and estates of the Protestants by their kindred from the enemies' quarters. Colonel Hewson, who succeeded Colonel Michael Jones as Governor of Dublin, issued another proclamation on 25 February, 1649-50, declaring that such was the neglect and contempt of the former proclamation by the protected Irish that there were daily murders, robberies, and other most cruel outrages committed by the Tories and rebels coming into the English quarters without control or pursuit of the Papist inhabitants. The kindred, he stated, were difficult to be found out, and when found, were not worth the finding. He accordingly ordained that all the inhabitants within the English quarters (being Papists), that should suffer any of the said Tories and rebels to pass through any of their baronies, should contribute rateably with those of the barony where the outrage was committed, unless within ten days they made the criminals amenable."*

Here was protection with a vengeance! By Jones's proclamation the Irish (said to be "protected"), within the English quarters were made responsible for the outrages committed, and the preys carried off from those quarters by the Irish who were still in arms, over whom, of course, they could exercise no manner of control. Small armies were still actively engaged in the field, and carried on a system of incursions and reprisals with which peaceable and "protected" inhabitants had nothing to do. The English in the case were, of course, praiseworthy soldiers carrying on legitimate warfare, whilst the Irish were called Tories and robbers. Colonel Hewson begins his proclamation with the assertion that Jones's was "neglected and despised," but the real truth seems to be that the protected Irish were so fined and fleeced under it, that they were no longer able to pay the charges imposed on them by their protectors, and so Hewson enlarged the area of responsibility by mulcting the inhabitants of the baronies through which Tories (or raiders) were allowed to pass on their expeditions, as if those peaceable and unarmed people could prevent them. The Tories being outlaws, carried arms in defiance of authority, whilst it was death for the peaceable, "protected" papists to have such in their

* Ibid.

possessions, and yet they were bound under heavy penalties to arrest or rout the armed Tories! This was a hard fate indeed, for they must choose between being shot down on the one side, and utter ruin on the other.*

The Presbyterians of Ulster were condemned to transplantation as well as the Irish Papists; but observe what happened in the sequel. "The Presbyterians had sided with the Parliament from the commencement of the Civil War, until the Independents became the prevailing party and executed the King. They acknowledged no presbyters, no ordination, and superseded the Presbyterian worship. The Presbyterians had been opposed to the King and the Royalists, by them styled *Malignants*, as supporters of prelacy, until the King's death; but they fell off from the Parliament when Cromwell and the Independents destroyed the King and the monarchy, and had superseded the Presbyterian discipline. The engagement, under the Act of 12th August, 1652, for the settlement of Ireland was, to be faithful to the Commonwealth as established without a King or House of Lords. The Presbyterians refused this oath as against the Covenant, and Sir Robert Adair and others of their party were sent to Munster to examine the places intended for their settlement. The scheme of transplanting them was in all particulars like the scheme for transplanting the Irish proprietors, except only that the transplantation of the Irish was mercilessly enforced, while that against the Scots of Ulster never proceeded beyond their threatening orders."†

The country was divided into Precincts. On the 6th of December, 1653, Commissioners of Inquiry into the delinquency of Landed Proprietors in the fifteen Precincts were directed to appoint special Commissioners in each Precinct, with power to summon and examine witnesses upon oath, on a set of interrogatories formed to elicit the delinquency of each proprietor.

* Specimen of the fines imposed. Papist inhabitants of the barony of Dunboyne to pay £185, decreed to H. Mills and W. Kennedy; the said inhabitants of Dunboyne to recover contribution against the Papist inhabitants of Ratoath and Deece, through which the enemy passed; or against harbourers of said Tories, or who neglected to raise the hue and cry. Cromw. Settlement, 336 note, ^A/₁₁, p. 276.

Obs. The price set on the head of a Tory was from 40s. to £30 according to the quality of the Tory who had owned the head. Any Tory who had not been convicted of any previous murder, could by murdering any two of his comrades and bringing in their heads, purchase his own pardon. Cromw. Settl., p. 344.

† "The Settling of Ireland." A MS. by J. P. Prendergast, marked V, and kindly placed at my disposal by that gentleman. This "Settling of Ireland" was, as Borlase correctly calls it: "That great Act of Confiscation of all the Rebels' lands," and was passed the 12th of August (1652). *Irish Insurrection*, p. 365.

The delinquency of the Irish was of easy proof; for to be *Irish* and *Catholic* was to be transportable. According to the first principles of justice, everyone is to be deemed innocent until he is proved to be guilty. And by that rule the English and Protestant inhabitants of Ireland were dealt with. To have been in arms against the Parliament, to have been a besieger of Derry, to have shared in the driving of Colonel Monk from his command, were crimes, which if alleged and proved before the Commissioners, a British or Scottish Protestant was to be transplanted. But in the case of the Irish,—every Irish proprietor was deemed guilty. The dreadful letters I. P., or Irish Papist (not I. R., or Irish Rebel), after each name were enough to condemn any of them to Connaught, for all proprietors were to proceed to Athlone, and there produce each “the series of their Carriages,”—in other words, prove his “Constant Good Affection” to the Parliament of England.*

* Ibid.

CHAPTER XXI.

OLIVER CROMWELL died at Whitehall, on the 12th of August 1658; "and on the same day happened the greatest storm of wind that ever was known."* The Council immediately assembled, and the result of their deliberations was an order to proclaim his elder son, Richard, Protector, on the ground that he had been declared by his late highness his successor in that dignity. It is not at all certain that "his highness" had made such an appointment. However, Richard was proclaimed as Lord Protector in all places, the ceremony being performed in the usual manner of announcing the accession of a new Sovereign. There was not a murmur of opposition on the occasion. But Richard Cromwell had not the ability to hold his ground in this new and trying position. England still swarmed with Cavaliers who watched every opportunity to find fault with his government, and exaggerate its defects. Other enemies he also had. Disappointed men of his own party, who had been awed into silence by his father, now began to show their discontent and ambition. Oliver was made Protector, or was strong enough to seize that office, because he was a brave and successful soldier; but here was a man who had never drawn a sword. Was he to be elevated over the heads of those who had fought and bled for the good old cause? He was despised by the army, officers and men. His authority, such as it was, declined daily, until he found himself without any. He was then ordered to remove from Whitehall, the Parliament undertaking to pay his debts, which amounted to some £30,000, and the nation found itself in the hands of the military. The Parliament made some efforts to assert its authority, but the "strong hand" always wins in such struggles; so the army, quartered in London and its neighbourhood, was now the government *de facto*.

Henry Cromwell, Oliver's second son, was a very different person from his brother, Richard. The latter, in his father's lifetime gave himself up to gaiety and debauchery, chiefly among the Cavaliers, whom he, no doubt, found pleasanter companions than the pious fanatics who surrounded the Lord Protector. Henry embraced a military life, and soon became

* Wade's British Chronology, 3rd Ed. p. 214.

a captain in the regiment of guards belonging to Fairfax, the Lord-General. He accompanied his father on his Irish expedition, and afterwards governed it, first as Major-General, and later with the title of Lord-Deputy. His rule in Ireland has been generally, and it would seem, justly praised for its mildness. When his brother Richard was compelled to retire from Whitehall, a strong resistance was expected from Henry and his Irish forces, with whom he was a favourite; but he was perplexed with the different courses suggested to him by his friends. He hesitated too long, and his indecision ruined him. So being reduced to the necessity of becoming a suppliant to the Parliament, he was graciously permitted by them to retire into private life. Thus rapidly did the house that Oliver built disappear from the scene!

The Cavaliers were in high spirits, as they considered they now saw the way clear for the King's restoration; but the difficulties still before them were much greater than they imagined. The ambitious designs of the chief generals, from amongst whom it was possible another Oliver might arise, were full of danger to the royal cause; and the royalists themselves had, by their impatience, well nigh dashed to pieces the hopes of a speedy restoration. A rising in favour of the King was organised in every county, but it broke down utterly, except in the case of Booth's movement in Cheshire, which at first was formidable; but Lambert, by the rapidity of his movements and his generalship, soon dispersed the insurgents. In spite of all mishaps, however, Monk succeeded in effecting the restoration of Charles Stuart to the throne of his ancestors. This famous man was of a good Devonshire family, being the son of Sir Thomas Monk. His father's property was heavily encumbered, and he being a younger son, was thrown upon his own resources. So he took to the profession of arms before he had completed his seventeenth year, and was one of the unsuccessful expedition sent to make a descent upon Cadiz, in 1625. He was afterwards employed in other Continental wars in which England was then engaged. In February, 1642, he arrived in Dublin with the rank of Lieut.-Colonel, in charge of 1,500 foot soldiers, which together with 400 horse, under the command of his kinsman, Sir R. Greville, were sent as reinforcements to aid in putting down the Rising of 1641. In 1649, we find him governor of Dundalk, which he held for the Parliament. On the 8th of May in that year, articles were agreed upon between himself and Owen Roe O'Neill, which were very favourable to Owen and the Irish.* Having been necessi-

* See p. 294.

tated to yield Dundalk to Colonel Mark Trevor, he proceeded to England, where he was greatly blamed by the Council of State for having concluded a peace "with that grand and bloody Irish rebel, Owen Rowe O'Neill."* Although the Council pronounced no distinct censure on Monk, interpreting what he did as an error of judgment, he was much provoked by the whole business, and "some did think it was never foregotten by him."†

From the time of Cromwell's famous march in pursuit of the King to Worcester, Monk had commanded in Scotland, where, instead of concerning himself with the movements and intrigues of parties in England, he appeared to have no other occupation than the duties of his place—to preserve the discipline of his army, and enforce the obedience of the Scots. He sent despatches regularly to Cromwell, but to his credit, be it said, that they were business-like documents, equally free from flattery of the Protector, and from those pious sentiments and quotations in which others indulged who wished to stand well with him. Monk had two qualities in greater abundance than most other men, impenetrable secrecy, and the power of dissembling his real sentiments; and it was to a considerable extent, through their means that, on the 29th of May, 1660, he succeeded in establishing Charles II. in Whitehall, undisputed King of England.‡ With the intricate movements of Monk, and the King's triumphant progress from Dover to London, we have no concern here. Besides they can be found in the histories of the period. One thing, however, may be said: it is, that Monk has been blamed on all sides for not exacting some terms from Charles which would bind him to govern in a constitutional manner. His motive for this can be only guessed at, but certain it is that his not having done so brought ruin on the House of Stuart.

The Irish expected that the Restoration of Charles would have brought them some amelioration of their wrongs and sufferings. They had fought for his father, they had fought for himself. For although their enemies, that they might rob them with impunity, persisted in calling them rebels, they were always devoted to the royal cause, while at the same time putting forward, as they had a perfect right to do, their claim to be governed by the same laws as the rest of his subjects. It was not long before Charles showed that his Irish Catholic subjects—plundered, transported, transplanted, as they had been for attachment to his

* Whitelock's English Affairs, p. 419.

† Ibid.

‡ See Preface to Skinner's Life of Monk. By Rev. W. Webster, p. viii. Lingard's England, Vol. VIII., p. 299.

house—had nothing to expect from him. He began by heaping favours on his enemies, to the neglect of his friends who had staked and lost everything in his service. During the interregnum, Broghill was president of Munster, and Coote of Connaught. There are no names in the whole range of our history, Cromwell's alone excepted, more suggestive of blood and murder than these two. Broghill deserted the King and joined Cromwell, and was, moreover, a cruel villain; while the Cootes, father and son, in their thirst for blood, spared neither women nor children. But the women and children tortured and slaughtered by them, were the wives and daughters and children of men who had fought for their rightful sovereign against his enemies.

Well, the Restoration of the King took place on the 29th of May, 1660, and so great was his hurry to reward and honour his enemies, that in the following September, about three months after his arrival in London, he created Broghill Earl of Orrery, and Coote, Earl of Mountrath,* making them also Lords-Justices to rule the people they had plundered, and whose kith and kin they had slaughtered.

The Cromwellians, although the children of light, were also wise in their generation, and when they saw the Restoration of the King was about to happen, they, in spite of their hatred of kingship, proceeded not only to make their peace with him, but to secure his goodwill in a very effective way. On the fall of Richard Cromwell, a council of officers was established in Dublin; these summoned a convention of deputies from the Protestant proprietors; and the convention tendered to Charles the obedience of his ancient kingdom of Ireland. It was not that the members felt any strong attachment to the cause of royalty. They had been among the most violent and enterprising of its adversaries; but their fear of the natives, whom they had trampled in the dust, compelled them to follow the footsteps of the English Parliament. To secure the royal protection, they made the King an offer of a considerable sum of money, assured him, though falsely, that the Irish Catholics meditated a general insurrection, and prayed him to summon a Protestant Parliament in Ireland, which might confirm the existing proprietors in the undisturbed possession of their estates. The present was graciously accepted; and the penal laws against the Irish Catholics were ordered to be strictly enforced; but Charles was unwilling to call a parlia-

* "Roger Boyle, Lord Broghill (afterwards Earl of Orrery), whose name, like that of Sir C. Coote, seems ever the prelude of woe to the Irish," &c.—*Cromwell Settlement*, p. 94.

ment, because it would necessarily consist of men, whose principles, civil and religious, he had been taught to distrust.*

With regard to the "General Insurrection" of the Catholics, we may ask how they could rise in rebellion, imprisoned as they were in Connaught, with the sea at one side of them and the Shannon at the other, and as if that was not sufficient to shut them in, there was a cordon of the ex-soldiers of Cromwell planted round about them like a belt of trees round a demesne.

"The King was proclaimed in Dublin, on May 14th, and as soon as the order was received, in all the great towns of the kingdom with wonderful acclamations of joy. This was followed with a very handsome and loyal address [from the convention mentioned above], and a present of £20,000 to his Majesty, £4,000 to the Duke of York, and £2,000 to the Duke of Gloucester. The Convention afterwards, on the 25th of that month, appointed the Lord Broghill, Sir C. Coote, and others, to attend his Majesty as their Commissioners, to present to him the desires of the Nation, and on the 28th, adjourned to the first of November following.† In their instructions to the Commissioners they besought his Majesty to call a Parliament in Ireland, consisting of Protestant peers and Commoners; and in order thereto, to appoint a chief governor and council for the transmission of bills to the King and Council in England. The rest of their desires were a general pardon and indemnity to all the Protestants in Ireland, in such a manner, and with such exceptions, as should be agreed on in the next Parliament [an exclusively Protestant one]; an Act of Attainder in the same manner; a settlement of the book of rates by the like authority; a remission of all compositions, and Exchequer rents reserved on grants made before October 23rd, 1641, till the last Easter [1660]; a confirmation of judicial proceedings, and of all ordinances and declarations of the Convention, and (what they had most at heart) an Act for settling the estates of Adventurers, soldiers, and transplanted Irish in Connaught and Clare."‡

It is commonly asserted by the historians of the period, that the Irish Catholic proprietors who had been declared by Cromwell innocent of the rebellion, and who had been ejected from their

* Clarendon Contin., 57. Lingard's England, Vol. IX., p. 267.

† It was certainly a cool piece of effrontery for this knot of Cromwellian officers to call themselves the nation.

‡ Carte's Ormonde, Vol II., p. 204. Taking all the circumstances of the case into account, I think it would be impossible to find a parallel for the list of favours demanded (rather than asked) from Charles II., by those who were in Ireland the instruments and representatives of his father's murderers.

estates and transplanted to Connaught, did, without awaiting the process of law, expel the intruders and re-enter on their patrimonial lands. But how far the "innocent" (as they were called) Irish carried this system of re-entering by force is now impossible to determine, as the documents which would clear it up have been lost. One thing is certain, that whatever those Catholic proprietors did would be sure to be exaggerated and turned to their disadvantage by the new settlers in their communications to England; and one historian says, no doubt with perfect truth, that these acts of the Irish were most acceptable to the new English, because they enabled them to arouse the prejudices of those in England against them.*

Even before the above Commissioners had been dispatched to

* See Leland's Ireland, Vol. III., p. 409.

Failing to find satisfactory evidence about this re-entering of the Irish proprietary without legal authority, I had recourse to my learned friend, J. P. Prendergast, Esq., for advice, who, in reply, was kind enough to write me the following letter:—

"MY DEAR CANON O'ROURKE,—To what extent the late proprietors attempted to get back into their lands at the Restoration, I have never been able to ascertain. But as the occupants had no legal title, *some* probably did try. This was no crime in their view, as they [the late proprietors] had good right. The King on coming to London issued a Proclamation prepared for him by the Convention, ordering no Adventurer or Soldier to be interfered with; but this had not the force of law.

"To what extent the former proprietors proceeded to recover their lands I could never learn. The numbers were probably exaggerated by the Cromwellians. There was a terrible loss of documents by the great fire of 15th of April, 1711, so that much of the history has been irreparably lost.

"Yours very truly,

"JOHN P. PRENDERGAST."

"P.S.—A more common thing was, for some of those Irish officers who had borne the King's Ensigns in France, Spain, and Flanders, to get the King's letter restoring them; and the Cromwellian occupant not knowing how far he might resist the King's command, yielded up his lot. But no sooner was the Declaration of Settlement of 30th November, 1660, issued than the Cromwellian applied to the Commissioners for executing the Declaration, to be restored—and he was so! For near 6 months (from 29th May to 30th Nov., 1660), the Cromwellians had no security, but the King's Proclamation of May 29, 1660, that they should not be disturbed, but as the King's Signature to his Letter under Privy Seal, was as good as his Signature to the Proclamation, the Cromwellian thought he was bound to yield. This I learned from the only book of Orders of the Commissioners that escaped destruction. There must have been many, many of these Order Books."

Obs. The "innocent" Irish had as good a right to enter at once upon the possession of their property at the Restoration as the loyal English had, yet the latter did so, and no fault was found with them for so doing. With reference to the Duke of Ormonde, Carte says:—"The Parliament of England restored the Duke to his estate in Ireland; but this was only a mark of their respect, for he might as well have entered upon his own lands as *all in England did, whose estates had been taken from them by the usurpers, for their loyalty.*" Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 398. The Italics are mine in the above extract.—J. O'R.

the King, the Convention had taken care to send Sir John Clotworthy and Mr. William Aston as Commissioners to the English Parliament, "to see that nothing was there done to the prejudice of the Adventurers or soldiers, or towards qualifying the Irish for recovering possession of their estates. They were apprehensive that the Act of Oblivion and general Indemnity, which the English Parliament were drawing up, in order to be presented to the King at landing, might be so extensive as to comprehend the Roman Catholics of Ireland. To prevent this, other Agents (besides those of the Convention) were sent over by the Adventurers and other parties concerned in the new purchases in that kingdom. These all attended the House of Commons in England, suggesting continually that they could never be secure in any Parliament that should be called in Ireland, except they could exclude out of the Act of Indemnity, then under their consideration, all persons who had any hand in the Rebellion; under which notion they comprehended promiscuously all those of the Romish religion who had been either sequestered or in arms." This "notion" substantially meant the exclusion of the whole Catholic Population of Ireland from the Act of Indemnity. The Act was prepared in accordance with these suggestions; it was provided by one of the clauses, that "it should not extend to restore to any persons the estates disposed of by authority of any Parliament or Convention, and it was with some difficulty that the exception was inserted of 'the Marquis of Ormonde and other Protestants of Ireland.' Some other provisos were attempted, which must have utterly ruined the old English families of the country; but they were suspended, and afterwards defeated by the Marquis."*

The reader may well pause in surprise when he contrasts this legislation with what was done with regard to England and Scotland. The English Act of Indemnity was with justice called an act of general pardon, for it declared, "that all the injuries and offences against the Crown or individuals, arising out of quarrels between political parties since the 1st of June, 1637, should be and were forgiven." Then came the exceptions. 1. From this general pardon were excepted fifty-one individuals actually concerned in the death of the King's father. A few more were excepted, as far as regarded liberty and property; and sixteen by name as to eligibility to hold office, civil, military or ecclesiastical. It was even conceded that nineteen of the regicides who had yielded themselves up should not be executed without a

* Leland's Ireland, Vol. III., pp. 410-11.

special Act of Parliament passed for that purpose.* So much for England. Now let us see how Scotland fared. "In Scotland during the Commonwealth, justice had been administered by English Commissioners, without any regard to the laws and constitution of that Kingdom, whereupon the King, by his proclamation, ordered these tribunals to be abolished on the 22nd of August (1660), and that the Kingdom should be restored to its ancient form of Government. A committee of the three estates was convened, the great officers of state appointed out of the native nobility, and a Parliament summoned to meet at Edinburgh the 12th of Dec., (1660), to whom the King referred the preparing an act of indemnity."†

As has been stated above, three accredited representative bodies were sent to England at this time—two by the Convention of Cromwellian officers sitting in Dublin (one to the King and one to the Parliament), and the third by the Adventurers and other interested parties. The object of all was substantially the same, to so misrepresent the native Irish as to induce the authorities in England to keep them outlaws, lest they should derive any advantage from the Restoration. Here is what the Protestant Leland writes about the way they were treated at home: "In the meantime the severest ordinances lately made [by the Cromwellians] against the Irish Roman Catholics were strictly executed. *They were not allowed to pass from one Province to another on their ordinary business; many of them were imprisoned, their letters were intercepted; their gentry were forbidden to meet, and thus deprived of the opportunity of choosing agents, or representing grievances.*"‡ So their enemies had ample time to fill the minds of the King and his Council with prejudices against them, founded on baseless falsehoods, which they had no opportunity of contradicting. And because they spoke with warmth, when at last admitted to appear before the King and Council, Ormonde says of them with haughty commiseration:—"I fear the liberty allowed the Irish to speak for themselves, will turn to their prejudice by the unskilful use they make of it, in justifying themselves, instructing the King and Council in what is good for them, and recriminating of others. Whereas a modest extenuation of their crimes, an

* Lingard, Vol. IX., p. 6. 25 of the regicides were already dead, 19 had escaped beyond the seas, and 29 remained in custody—73. The number of the King's judges was 67; the other 6 were connected with his death in other ways.

† Wade's British Chronology, 2 Ed., p. 221.

‡ History of Ireland, Vol. III., p. 410. Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 205. The Italics are mine.—J.O'R.

humble submission to, and imploring his Majesty's grace, and a declaration of their hearty desire to live quietly and brotherly [as became plundered serfs] with their fellow-subjects for the future, would better have befitted the disadvantage they are under, and have prevailed more than all their eloquence. But it is long since I have given over any hope that they would do, or be advised to do, what was best for them."*

Preposterous as were the demands of the agents sent from Dublin to the English Parliament by the Cromwellian officers, the King's "Declaration for the Settlement of Ireland" was mainly founded upon them. This Declaration is embodied in, and forms the chief part of, the Act of Settlement, the preamble to which is, as Mr. Froude confesses, "a miracle of ingenuity." At the time the Act became law, the Lord Lieutenant was the same Ormonde whom Cromwell had defeated, thereby acquiring absolutely the power of confiscating the lands of the Irish people. This confiscation on the part of Cromwell, so far from being reversed by the Act of Settlement, was *legalised* by it; yet to the passing of the said Act, the facile Ormonde made no objection whatever,—on the contrary he exerted all his influence to have it passed. In the preamble Oliver was denounced and disowned with expressions of horror, but his followers were made the legal possessors of those lands, of which he had robbed the real owners who were the King's loyal subjects, at a time when he was in rebellion against him. Coote and Broghill were made Lords Justices—were titled and caressed as if they had been true to the King, whereas they fought forcibly against him, under the man who had the chief hand in bringing his father to the block.†

The outburst of loyalty from this Cromwellian Parliament to Charles II. is admirable, and indeed edifying. "We humbly conceive," they state, that "it is our bounden duty at this time and in a special manner, as in the presence of God, to declare and testify that we renounce and abhor the bloudie, rebellious, and traitorous murder and parricide of your Majesty's most royal father of blessed memory, and the principles and practices of those who have opposed, or shall at any time disturb or oppose your Majesty's rights and happy settlement in this your kingdom, and we shall readily and faithfully, according to our bounden duty and allegiance, labour to bring all such persons unto condign punishment."‡ "A miracle of ingenuity" sure enough is this

* Ormonde's Letter to Sir M. Eustace in Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 233.

† "The execution of the King, as well as others, are not to be considered as Acts of the Parliament, but of Cromwell."—C. J. Fox, *Life of James II.*, p. 13. Froude's *English in Ireland in 18th century*, Vol. I., p. 148.

‡ 13 Chas. II., A.D. 1660, cap. 1.

preamble. The denunciation of "the traitorous murder and bloody parricide" can only refer to Oliver and his party, but with admirable skill and adroitness, the Parliament further on dimly shadows forth the Irish papists as the persons, whom, in their loyal zeal, they are ready to bring to condign punishment. But there is another passage in the preamble constructed with an ingenuity at least equal to the above. The Act of Settlement was dealt with by the Irish Parliament in the years 1660, 1661 and 1662, and these are called in the Irish Statutes the 13th, 14th and 15th years of the reign of Charles II., although his Restoration only happened in the first of them, 1660. This arrangement of the years of his reign ignored the whole interregnum, in which Oliver played the principal part. The starting point taken seems to have been the time at which Charles I. was delivered up to the English Parliament by the Scots, which occurred in January, 1647.* Having abolished Oliver, one would suppose the next thing to be done was to abolish all his doings; but no such thing. "No proceedings," they say, "in law or equity since 23rd October, 1641, shall be avoided [made void] for want of legal power in the judges . . . or by reason of the names, stiles, and titles used . . . or *language used*." Latin was the language of the law, but in Oliver's time it was set aside for the English. Acts and Ordinances were to be as good "*as if effectual Acts of Parliament*," and not to be vitiated by the authority put forward for them, namely *Custodes Libertatis Angliæ Auctoritate Parliamenti*. And further, they were not to be vitiated by the use of the name or style of Oliver, Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland; or of the name, &c., of Richard, or by reason of any alteration of the said names, or *any other cause*. And then comes the following admirable *Brutum Fulmen*: "And the actings, doings and proceedings thereupon shall be of such and *no other force, effect and virtue* than if such courts, judges, justices, commissioners, officers, and ministers had acted by virtue of a true, just, and legal authority, and as if the name, entry and enrolment thereof were in Latin, and as if the several acts and ordinances, or pretended acts and ordinances were made by both or either House of Parliament; or

* Some months previous to this time the Scots had, through Montrevil, the French agent, invited Charles I. to come to their army, and assured him that he might remain there with all security, and that his conscience should not be forced; on this assurance he left Oxford in disguise, and went to them. He arrived with the Scots on 5th May, 1646. On 4th of January, 1647, (it would seem by previous arrangement) a Committee of both Houses was appointed to receive him from the Scots with 900 horse. The Scots after receiving £200,000 paid them by Parliament delivered up Charles to the English commissioners.—*Wade's British Chronology*, 3rd Ed., p. 192.

by Oliver, late styled Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging." From the form in which the above passage begins it would seem that the "actings, doings," &c., of the Cromwellian rebels were to be effaced from the statute book, and treated as if non-existent. Then by the cunningly devised phraseology of the passage we are prepared for a recognition of those "actings and doings," but of a very slight and minimized kind. At last we are told with a well-feigned and apparently virtuous severity, that they "shall be of such and no other force, effect and virtue than if such courts, judges, justices, commissioners, &c., had acted by virtue of a true, just, and legal authority." Could cool effrontery go further? They give the acts of the Usurper and his rebel followers the same binding power as if they had emanated from the highest authority known to the constitution—the King, Lords and Commons of the nation, while by their crooked misleading phraseology, they wish the reader to infer that they are denouncing those "actings and doings" with loyal indignation.

The principal provisions of the Act of Settlement were: 1. It confirmed to the Adventurers all lands possessed by them on May 7th, 1659, and allotted to them according to the Acts of 17 and 18 of Charles I., and it engaged to make good any deficiencies to such as made proof of them before the 1st of May following. 2. It confirmed to the soldiers the lands possessed by them, and allotted to them for their pay; excepting church lands, lands obtained by false measurements, bribery, perjury, &c. 3. The officers who had served before June 5th, 1649, were to be satisfied for their respective arrears. The peace of '49 (as it was called) was made in the January of that year, and the King was beheaded on the 30th of the same month, in the same year. 4. Protestants, whose estates had been given to Adventurers or soldiers, except such as had been in rebellion before the Cessation, or had taken out decrees for lands in Connaught or Clare, were to be *forthwith* restored, and they who were ousted from the said lands were to be reprimed.* 5. "Innocent" papists [left for the last of course], who had taken lands in Connaught; that is, who had been transported to Connaught against their will, were to be restored to their estates by May 2nd, 1661; not *forthwith* like the Protestants; but if they had sold the Connaught lands, they were to satisfy the purchaser for the price paid, and the necessary repairs and improvements he had made; and the Adventurers or soldiers so removed were to be *forthwith* reprimed. In this matter of innocent Papists there

* I.e., recompensed with other lands of equal value to those given up.

was a restriction made with regard to such as had lands within corporations. These were not to be restored to their old possessions, but only to be reprized in the neighbourhood. The reasons for this, although not mentioned in the Act, were (1) because the towns were the strongholds by which the country was held, and therefore were to be exclusively Protestant, (2) they returned the great majority of the members to Parliament, and being Protestant, would, as a matter of course, return Protestants. As for such as had been in rebellion, but submitted, and constantly adhered to the Peace of 1648, if they stayed at home, sued out decrees, and possessed lands in Connaught and Clare, they were to be bound thereby, and not relieved against their own act; if they served faithfully under his Majesty's ensigns abroad, and had sued out no decrees in Connaught or Clare, in compensation of their former estates, they were to be restored to them, *but not till the Adventurer or soldier who was to be removed had a reprice set out to him*; had a reasonable satisfaction given him for the repairs and improvements he had made, and was reimbursed the debts or other legal incumbrances which he had found upon the estate and had discharged; such restoration and reprizes to be effected by October 23rd, 1661.

There were thirty-nine of the Irish nobility and gentry (some of them entirely innocent, the others constant adherents to the peace), whom the King thought worthy of his particular favour, and he therefore directed that these (who were all *named* in the Declaration, and for that reason generally called *Nominees*) should, without being put to the trouble of further proof, be restored to their former estates, according to the rules and directions given in the case of such as had faithfully served under his Majesty's ensigns abroad. They are given below.*

* 1. Earl of Clanrickarde; 2. Earl of Westmeath; 3. Earl of Fingal; 4. Earl Clancarty; 5. Lord V. Gormanston; 6. Lord V. Mountgarret; 7. Lord V. Dillon; 8. Lord V. Taaffe; 9. Lord V. Ikerryn; 10. Lord Viscount Netterville; 11. Lord V. Galmoy; 12. Lord V. Mayo; 13. Lord Baron Dunboyne; 14. Lord B. Trimblestown (sic); 15. Lord B. Dunsany; 16. Lord B. of Upper Ossory; 17. The Lord Bermingham; 18. Baron of Athenry; 19. Lord B. of Strabane; 20. Colonel Richard Butler; 21. Sir Geo. Hamilton, Knt. and Bt.; 22. Sir Valentine Browne, Knt.; 23. Sir Richard Barnewel, Bt.; 24. Sir Remond Everard, Knt.; 25. Sir Thomas Sherlock, Knt.; 26. Sir Dermot O'Shaghnessy, Knt.; 27. Sir Daniel O'Bryon, Knt.; 28. Col. Christopher O'Brien; 29. Mr. Richard Belling, son to Sir Henry Belling, Knt.; 30. Richard Lane of Tulske, Esquire; 31. Mr. Edmond Fitzgerald, of Balymalo; 32. Mr. Thomas Butler, of Kilconnel; 33. — M'Namara, of Creevagh; 34. Mr. David Power, of Kilbolane; 35. Mr. Donough O'Callaghane, of Clonmeen; 36. Mr. James Copinger, of Cloghane, in the County of Cork; 37. Mr. George Fitzgerald of Tiperochane; 38. Mr. Barnard Talbot, of Rathdowne; 39. and Conly Geoghegan of Donore. At the final settlement, under the Act of Explanation, the King added twenty additional Nominees of Ormonde's choosing; but none of

The Commissioners for carrying out the King's Declaration for the Settlement of Ireland, sat at Dublin, and issued proclamations to all Adventurers, &c., within forty days, to bring in the particulars of their estates, and all persons to enter their claims before the 1st of May, 1661. But nothing, or next to nothing, was done in the matter, because the authority of the Commissioners was, on the very threshold of the business, denied by the judges, who gave it as their opinion, that the Declaration being only an act of State, was not a sufficient warranty in disposing of men's estates; and even if it were, the case would remain substantially the same, as no one could be ousted from possession of the land he held until a reprice was assigned him, and there was no prospect of there being sufficient lands found for these reprizes. Such was the care taken by Charles of the rebels who had dethroned and beheaded his father, and who had only just entered into the possession of lands which were not theirs, and such was the conduct of the partial judges who acted in their interest, although the true owners had been but a short time before driven like droves of cattle into Connaught by the decree of a man whose corpse was disinterred at the Restoration and hung in chains, as the corpse of a rebel and regicide.

A Parliament was summoned for the 8th of May (1661), and it proved to be precisely in accordance with the request made to the King for a Protestant Parliament. The effect of the opinion of the judges, denying the power of the Commissioners to deal with landed property, left the Adventurers and Soldiers in possession of their lands and tenements, and they were, in consequence, the electors who returned the members of the Lower House of Parliament. The elections were so well managed that the Cromwellian settlers were in an overwhelming majority. Even of the old Protestant proprietors but

those Nominees were restored to their entire estates; they only got their residences with 2,000 acres of land attached.

On reading over the foregoing list one is struck with the preponderance of Norman-English names in it, from which a natural inference would be that the Norman-English were more devoted to the Royal cause than the Irish. But this would be a hasty and an incorrect conclusion. There is another list of names in the Act of Settlement, embodied in the King's "Declaration," but which is too long to be inserted here; it is the list of those officers and others who fought under the King's ensigns abroad. This was a far severer test of loyalty than that of remaining quiescent within the English Pale in Ireland. This list contains between three and four hundred names, and in it the O's, the Macs, and other unmistakable Irish patronymics are quite in the ascendant. 13 Charles II., Caps. I. and II. 14 and 15 Charles II., Cap. II. Irish Statutes, Vol. II., Cap. II.

few were returned, and not one Catholic.* The King had recommended Sir W. Domville, his Attorney-General, as Speaker of the House of Commons, but Sir Audley Mervyn, a vain man, and a great talker, being desirous for the post, wrote to the King representing his own merits, and his sufferings for the royal cause, and begging that his Majesty would not interpose, but leave the choice of Speaker to the House. The King did not insist on his recommendation; Mervyn was chosen, as "being inclined to the Presbyterians," while Domville, the abler and more popular man, because suspected of being favourable to the Irish [Papists], was rejected.†

The Parliament of 1661 was all that the Adventurers and Soldiers could wish, but this might not be the case in future Parliaments, as the Irish were going into the Courts of Law, intending to get their outlawries reversed, and so obtain writs of ejectment against the possessors of their estates. By this proceeding the Cromwellians were threatened with a double danger; for if the Irish got writs of ejectment, a number of Adventurers and Soldiers would be dispossessed; and the Irish [Papists] being re-instated would be in a position to return some members of their own Creed to parliament, who would give trouble and inflict injury on those Adventurers and Soldiers. The latter had begun to put themselves forward as the representatives of the English interest in Ireland, a faction which intended so to interpret the Act of Settlement, as to exclude the Papists from its benefits, and to confirm everything to themselves. This could not be easily done if the Papists had a party in the House that would insist on the terms of the Act of Settlement, and on the proper carrying out of its provisions.

The Adventurers and Soldiers, therefore, had the heads of a bill prepared imposing an oath on the members of Parliament which would have disqualified all the Roman Catholics. It was represented as absolutely necessary "to prevent an Irish interest from overpowering and destroying the English." When it came before the English Council it was set aside, and the promoters were told it was inopportune at a time when his Majesty was endeavouring to reconcile the jarring interests of his subjects in Ireland.‡ Nothing daunted they set about carrying their point by a clever trick. Under pretence of loyal zeal for his Majesty's interests, by involving other disaffected persons in the same incapacity with Catholics, they proposed

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 221.

† Ibid., pp. 222, et seq.

‡ Ibid., p. 223.

“that no members should sit in their House, but such as should take the oath of Allegiance and Supremacy, which Catholics could not take, and that none of those, nor the sons of any of those that sat in the pretended High Court of Justice for the trial of the late King, [not one of whom, as far as I can discover, was then residing in Ireland, save Colonel Scot, whom they excepted, and *herein lay the trick*], or in any other [Court of Justice], wherein sentence of death was pronounced against any of his Majesty’s subjects (except Colonel Thomas Scot, who had been very active in the Restoration), should be capable of sitting in that House.” But this was overruled by the Lords Justices, as trenching on the Royal prerogative, by assuming to themselves a power of requiring qualifications from members different from what was expressed in his Majesty’s writ. The Upper House consisted of 93 Peers, 21 of whom were Catholics. Bramhall, a Yorkshire man, who had been brought to Ireland by Wentworth, was the primate and Speaker of the House of Lords. He proposed a resolution which passed the House, that the peers should receive the Sacrament at his hands, a proceeding which would protestantize or exclude all the Catholics.

Whenever the “English interest” in Ireland experienced a check in their work of spoliation and extirpation, they had recourse to a device that seldom or never failed, which was the alarm that a rebellion was being organized in Ireland. “Sham plots had proved so fatally successful in promoting the designs of the Republican faction in England some years before ; and in the last year, the Adventurers had found the noise made about meetings of the Irish so very serviceable to them, in procuring a Proclamation for quieting possessions, and preserving them in the enjoyment of those freeholds, which were necessary to enable them to choose members of their own party, and out of which they were in danger of being ejected by law, that it was thought politick to have recourse to one in the present exigence. For this purpose a Committee was appointed to inquire into informations against the Irish, and the danger of the Kingdom from them. Informations of one sort or other will never be wanting, when it is the interest of men in power to encourage them, and they are sure to be received with favour and swallowed without examination, however trifling, ridiculous and improbable.”* This Committee collected very alarming information. It reported as follows: 1. There were numerous assemblies of the Irish in various places, under pretence of

* Carte’s Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 223.

frequenting Masses and other pretended religious duties.* 2. They had found the exercise of a foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the kingdom, and the enjoining and observing of extraordinary fasts. 3. A very dangerous symptom which fell under their notice was, "the endeavours of the Irish to buy serviceable horses."(!) 4. And there were meetings and consultations of the Irish in Dublin, and a concourse of armed men there. These and some other such trumpery charges were embodied in a solemn report and placed before the Lords-Justices, who saw through the sham. But it is not at all certain that they would have seen through it, only they knew the King did not want such reports. However, they thanked the Commissioners for their zeal; desired that the grounds of the more serious accusations might be communicated to them *then, or at some future time*. No grounds were produced, and the matter died out with the close of the session.†

In the restoration of lands, or the confirming of possessors in them, innocent papists were to be considered, but only in the last place. Who was an innocent papist? The "English interest in Ireland" did not believe, and was determined not to believe that such beings existed, but as they were named in the King's Declaration, some notice must be taken of them. The Irish who were entitled to the benefits of the Articles of 1648, regarded it as a great injustice, that the restitution of their estates should be postponed, until reprises were found and assigned to the Adventurers and soldiers who had got possession of them. They had no confidence in the Commissioners who had been appointed to carry out the Declaration, as most if not all of them, were, by interest, partizans of the Adventurers and soldiers. But most of all did they exclaim against the instructions given to those Commissioners, in which the conditions for innocence were so many, and so strict, that it was next to impossible for any Catholic to obtain a decision in his favour. These conditions are worth noting. They are as follow:—(1.) No man could be restored as an innocent papist, who at or before the Cessation of September 15, 1643, was of the rebel party; (2.) or enjoyed his estate, real or personal, in the rebel quarters, (except the inhabitants of Cork and Youghal, who were driven into those quarters by force); (3.)

* "All the foundation for this insinuation was, that there had been, of late, meetings of the poor Irish at Masses, in order to partake of a Jubilee which the Pope had sent them, but the whole kingdom knew they were in no condition to rebel, nor was it likely they should attempt it at a time when they were suing for grace and favours from his Majesty." Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 231.

† Ibid., pp. 223-4.

or who had entered into the Roman Catholic Confederacy before the peace of 1646; or (4.) who had at any time adhered to the Nuncio's or Clergy's party, or Papal power, in opposition to the King's, or who, having been excommunicated for adhering to his Majesty's authority, had afterwards owned his offence for so doing, and so got free from the excommunication; or (5.) who derived the title to his estate from any that had died guilty of the aforesaid crimes, or any of them; or (6.) who pleaded the Articles of the Peace for his estate; or (7.) who living in the English quarters, held a correspondence with the rebels; or (8.) who before the Peace of 1646, or that of 1648, had sat in any of the Confederate Roman Catholic Assemblies or Councils, or acted upon any Commissions or powers derived from them; or (9.) who employed agents to treat with any foreign Papal power, for bringing into Ireland foreign forces; or (10.) who had harassed the country as Tories before the Marquis of Clanrickarde had left the Government. Whoever came under anyone of these denominations was not to be deemed an innocent Papist.*

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 220.

Notes on the above Conditions with regard to innocent and non-innocent, (or nocent) Papists:—

(1.) The best commentary on this condition is, that some of the leading men who met Roger O'Moore and others of the Irish on the hill of Crofty, before the Cessation, and joined them in making plans for the raising of a Confederate [rebel] army, of which Viscount Gormanston was appointed General-in-Chief, were, together with him, the Lords Fingal, Trimbleston, Netterville, Sir Richard Barnwell, &c., to be restored to their estates, without any trouble. And moreover, those latter distinguished personages accepted various commands in the said Confederate army, and one of them, Lord Fingal, was restored to his estate before the Declaration for restoring them became law. (2.) This condition is a most atrocious one. Was a free and loyal man to give up his property, because it was within the rebel's quarters? and cast himself and his family houseless and homeless on the world? Some who did so, and had offered to take refuge in Dublin, were, by the Proclamation of the Lords-Justices, warned away from thence on pain of death, and ordered to return to their own houses in the country, *where they would be in the rebels' quarters, and in their power, in spite of themselves.* (3.) This is a very insidious condition; there was hardly a Catholic who belonged to the Confederation at all but had joined it before the Peace of 1646. (4.) This is quite misleading and incorrect. No person adhered to the Nuncio in opposition to the King's authority; they sometimes did so in opposition to Ormonde's, who was more than once in opposition to the King's wishes and interests, as may be gathered from the course of this history; and who proved himself a traitor to his King, in giving up Dublin to the Cromwellians, and who afterwards suffered a crushing defeat, and lost a fine army at Rathmines, in his attempt to re-take it. (5.) This requires no commentary. It punishes a man for the supposed faults of a dead ancestor, from whose views and principles he may entirely differ. (6.) It may be assumed that this refers to the Peace of 1648, which was made between Ormonde and the General Assembly after much discussion, and solemnly ratified in the Castle of Kilkenny, on the 17th January, 1649. It made many concessions to the Catholics regarding

I have given above, as briefly as I could, the conditions laid down for constituting "an innocent Papist," as the phrase was. These conditions were but so many traps set for the Catholics in order to deprive them of their just claims. It is said of Napoleon I., that when he was specially anxious to shoot some important officer belonging to the enemy, he ordered five or six cannon to be simultaneously fired at him, believing that though he might escape one or two shots, he could hardly be missed by a whole volley. Very similar was the condition of a poor Papist with regard to the conditions of innocency; there were ten of them levelled at him, so that though he might avoid or escape one, two, or three of them, it was piously thought by the holy aspirants to Irish estates that he could not escape them all. But to take another and a broader view, why should the latter have such a tremendous noise made about innocent and non-innocent Papists, when no question whatever was raised about innocent and non-innocent Protestants, Cromwellians or non-Cromwellians? They, as all the world knows, murdered their King, abolished Kingship (as they contemptuously called it), and invested the House of Commons with the Supreme power, removed the King's effigy from the great seal, and put a representation of that House of Commons in its place; so that writs no longer ran in the King's

freedom of worship, &c. While the Catholics were continuing to insist on concessions, which Ormonde said he had no power to grant, "The Remonstrance of the Army" of 20th November, 1648, was brought over from England to Lord Inchiquin, who had it immediately published. This Remonstrance was addressed to the Parliament, calling on it "to bring the King to Justice" [i.e. to trial and death]. "It had a wonderful effect in Ireland it removed all the difficulties which the Catholics, in their zeal for their religion, had thrown in the way of peace. The Assembly receded from their demands in that point, and on December 28th, upon consideration of his Majesty's present condition, and their own hearty desires of spending their lives and fortunes in maintaining his rights and interests, they resolved unanimously to accept the Marquis of Ormonde's 'answer to their propositions for Religion.'" (See Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 49.) There was chivalrous loyalty! but of course the Papists must be punished for it, as it were the right thing to punish them for whatever they did. (7.) If a person residing in the English quarters gave information injurious to the English, it would certainly call for punishment. (8.) The leading Catholics of the Kingdom had done so; and this clause seems framed for the purpose of robbing all, or nearly all the Catholics who were worth robbing. (9.) A vague condition. "Any foreign papal power" might mean any Catholic power; however, the condition seems to refer to the negotiations with the Duke of Lorraine, about sending money and troops to Ireland. Of these negotiations the Marquis of Clanrickarde (the first nominee mentioned by the King) was not only aware, but they were actually carried on by him. The first paper on the subject in his own Memoirs is headed, "The proceedings of the treaty between the Duke of Lorraine's Ambassador and me." (10.) A condition made against such Tories as represented the previous owners of estates, as it would be useless to make it against any other. The object of every condition was to enable the Adventurers and Cromwellian soldiers to become possessed of the whole of Ireland.

name, but in the name of the "Keepers of the liberty of England by authority of Parliament." Yet these are the men who had the unparalleled effrontery to call the King's loyal subjects papist rebels, and were permitted by the contemptible son of that King, to retain possession of the property of the Catholics of Ireland, of those who had never failed in their devotion to him, and who never put forward a demand or a declaration that did not contain a solemn pledge of their unswerving loyalty. When the circumstances of their position compelled the Supreme Council to coin money, one of the legends on their coins was "Floreat rex," whilst the representatives of the rebellious Parliament expressed, by their principles, not "Floreat Rex," but "Juguleter Rex," a principle they afterwards carried out to the letter by their acts. The same sentiment was recorded on the Seal of the Catholic Confederation, the full motto of which was, as previously recorded in this volume, "Pro Deo, Rege et Patria Hiberni Unanimes." But the motive of the Parliamentarians and Cromwellians in persisting to call the Irish Catholics rebels, is plain enough—they did so, because it entitled them or pretended it entitled them to plunder the said Catholics with impunity.

The Act of Settlement was passed through the Irish Parliament and became law on the 27th of September, 1662, but to execute it became a task of much difficulty. "By improvident grants of lands to the church, the Dukes of York, Ormonde, and Albemarle, the Earls of Ossory, Montrath, Kingston, Massareene, and several others, the fund for reprisals had been almost exhausted; and yet it was from that fund that compensation was to be furnished to the forty-nine officers, to the ensignmen, or those who had served in Flanders, and to the soldiers and Adventurers, who might be compelled to yield up their plantations by the Court of Claims. Among this class [the soldiers and adventurers], a general alarm was excited; for in the course of six months, during which the Commissioners sat, several hundred decrees of innocence had been issued, and three thousand petitions still remained for investigation. To secure themselves, they demanded an explanatory Act; the Duke of Ormonde, now Lord Lieutenant, repaired to London, and ten months were spent in useless attempts to reconcile the jarring interests of different parties."*

From the very beginning of these transactions, the actual occupants of the lands† "had displayed a bold defiance of decency

* Lingard's England, Vol. IX., p. 29.

† Nearly entirely Cromwellian soldiers and Adventurers.

and justice, in their efforts to bring the cause to a favourable termination. 1. They had recourse to bribery. A fund of more than twenty thousand pounds was subscribed and placed in the hands of Sir James Sheen, who hastened to London, and purchased at different rates, the patronage and good offices of persons supposed to possess influence in the Council, or over the mind of the King.* 2. To keep up the irritation of the public mind against the Irish Catholics, they had circulated reports of an intended rebellion, forwarded to the Council informations respecting imaginary plots, and at length produced a treasonable letter, supposed to be written by one clergyman to another, and dropped by the latter as he made his escape from the officers of justice. Many priests were immediately apprehended; all Catholic shopkeepers and mechanics were banished out of the principal towns; and the houses of the Catholic gentry were searched for the discovery of arms and ammunition. But the two clergymen, the supposed writer and receiver of the letter, boldly came forward and proved the forgery, to the entire satisfaction of the Council, and the confusion of those who had fabricated the pretended conspiracy.† At this period a protestation of allegiance drawn up by Richard Billings, was signed by the principal Irish Catholics, but certain passages of it were disapproved at Rome and Louvain. Other instruments were drawn up less offensive to Rome, but Ormonde rejected them as unsatisfactory. Ormonde's motives are usually very difficult to get at, but in the present instance we have them stated in his own words. "My aim," he writes, "was to work a division among the Romish Clergy, and I believe I had compassed it, to the great security of the Government and Protestants, and against the opposition of the Pope, and his creatures and nuncios, if I had not been removed from the Government, and if direct contrary counsels and courses had not been taken and held by my successors; of which some were too indulgent to the whole body of Papists, and others not much acquainted with any of them, nor considering the advantage of the division designed."‡

The Court of Claims was the necessary complement of the Act of Settlement. The time of its sitting was limited to twelve months, but it sat for only half that time, namely from February to August, 1663. During this time half the Catholics whose

* Orrery Letters, 101. Carte, ii., 232. "The Irish had no such sums to command, few friends about the Court, and no means of procuring any."—Carte, *ib.*

† Lingard, *loc. cit.*

‡ Ormonde's Letter to the Earl of Arran. Carte, Vol. II. Appendix, p. 101.

claims were heard were adjudged innocent, in spite of the many difficulties they had to encounter, as well from the rigorous conditions given in detail above, as from a swarm of corrupt witnesses that were daily employed against them. For the suborning of witnesses at these trials was so frequent and barefaced, that their perjuries were sometimes proved in open court by the testimony of honourable persons, who happened accidentally to be present. Sir William Petty boasted, when he had evicted the Duke of Ormonde out of some lands before this court, that he had gotten witnesses that would have sworn through a three inched board.* There had been four thousand claims of innocency entered in that court, yet they had not time to hear above six hundred, when the Commissioners closed their labours in August, 1663. *The claims of all innocents that had been transplanted into Connaught* were, by the Commissioners' instructions, not to be heard till those of innocents who had no land were first adjudged; so that *not one of them* had been heard, and those who were thereby aggrieved were left without a remedy in any way, but by Act of Parliament. Every innocent transported to Connaught was a Catholic, and chiefly, although not entirely, of the old Irish race. What remedy could they expect from a Protestant House of Commons, whose main purpose was to annihilate them? Not only were they robbed of their ancient and lawful inheritance, but they were refused the right which the most notorious malefactor can claim—the right to be heard.

Ormonde, the evil genius of the Irish race, and their religion, met them at every step and every turn; blasted their most reasonable hopes, and overreached them in their justest demands. The King had entrusted to him chiefly, if not solely, the drawing up of the Bill of Explanation. And an extension of the time for hearing claims ought, in all conscience and justice, form an essential part of that Bill. One-half of those who claimed innocency in the court had succeeded; only about one-fifth of the claims having been heard at the time the court ceased to sit. Three thousand claims remained uninvestigated, and as half those who had been heard were declared innocent, we may assume that fifteen hundred innocents had been unjustly plundered by the premature closing of the Court, and the refusal to extend its sittings. One of the Commissioners, Sir Richard Rainsford, declared that an application should be made for an extension of time to hear the remaining claims; but, says Mr. Carte, "the

* Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II. Id., p. 393.

† Id., p. 297.

Duke of Ormonde did not think it proper to insert a clause in the Bill, in the draught of which he was obliged to have the concurrence of the Council, for relief of those unheard innocents.* Concurrence of the Council indeed! Here is what Mr. Carte says elsewhere on this head: "The King seeing such a virulent distemper in the Irish House of Commons, did not think them proper persons to propose the means of a settlement, so that having rejected their Bill of Explanation, *he referred it entirely to the Duke of Ormonde to draw another.*"† Thus were the Catholics plundered and left without redress, whilst the rebels and regicides were left in quiet and secure possession of their lands; and not only without redress, but without pity and sympathy. The case of the forty-nine officers is always spoken of as one of great hardship. "The Adventurers and Cromwellian soldiers had," says Mr. Carte, "all that they could ask, granted to them in the Act of Settlement, but the officers who had served before 1649, and whose loyalty prevented them from being paid in the times of the usurpation, were treated with great inequality. . . . Whatever reason they had to complain, their duty and affection to the King made them declare themselves ready to be concluded by his Majesty's pleasure. *But the Irish were more clamorous.*" Here follows the case of those 49 officers as stated by a writer who knows the history of the period better than any one else: "At the Restoration the ruinous cities and towns (they had become ruinous for want of inhabitants), instead of being restored to the Irish, were given (except the properties of innocent Irish in Dublin and Drogheda) to the Protestant officers of the King's army who had fought against the Parliament (as well as the Irish) from 1641 to 1649, the Irish being still kept outside the walls."‡ The 49 officers had no grievance whatever, but the withholding of their pay; they were Protestants enjoying all the freedom that English law could give them, but those clamorous Irish were the real owners of the soil, which they now saw in the hands of Cromwellian rebels, and were besides slaves, with their religion proscribed in their native land. What wonder if they were clamorous? Ormonde indeed added twenty Catholics to the former list of nominees given above who received back their mansion-houses and two hundred acres of land. "But when compensation had been thus made to a few of the sufferers, what, it may be asked, became of the officers who had followed the royal fortune abroad, or of the three

* See Curry's Review, Vol. II., p. 116.

† Life of Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 297. Ibid., p. 220.

‡ The Settling of Ireland. By John P. Prendergast, MS. work. Fasciculus V.

thousand Catholics who had entered their claims of innocence? To all these the promises which had been made by the Act of Settlement were broken; the unfortunate claimants were deprived of their rights, and debarred from all hope of future relief. A measure of such sweeping and appalling oppression is perhaps without a parallel in the history of civilized nations. Its injustice could not be denied; and the only apology offered in its behalf, was the stern necessity of quieting the fears and jealousies of the Cromwellian Settlers, and of establishing on a permanent basis Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland.*

I close this chapter with some account of the trial and martyrdom of Oliver Plunket, the saintly Primate of Ireland from 1669 to 1681. He was of the noble house of the Plunkets of the county Meath, and was born at Loughcrew, in that county, in the year 1629. In order to pursue his studies in Rome he accompanied Father Scarampo to that city, on his return from Ireland. He entered the Irish College in 1646. Father Locke, who was then its rector, says of him, that in the Roman College "he was justly ranked amongst the foremost in talent, diligence, and progress in his studies." Dr. Plunket was nominated by the Sacred Congregation, Archbishop of Armagh, on the 9th of July, 1669, but did not arrive in Ireland until the Spring of 1670, being then forty years of age. He took up the work of his diocese with extraordinary zeal. In a letter written by him on the 18th June, 1670, to Cardinal Barberini, Cardinal Protector of the Church of Ireland, he says, that on his arrival in

* Lingard's *England*, Vol. IX., p. 30. Clarendon, 112, 134. Carte, 310-316. *Irish Statutes*, Vol. III., pp. 2-137. On the 27th of July, 1660, soon after his restoration the King expressed himself as follows, in his speech to the Parliament:—"I hope I need say nothing of Ireland, and that they alone shall not be without the benefit of my mercy; they have showed much affection to me abroad, and you will have a care of my honour, and of what I have promised to them." And again in the Declaration for the Settlement of Ireland, on the 30th November following, he says:—"In the last place we did, and must always remember the great affection a considerable part of that nation expressed to us, during the time of our being beyond seas, when with all cheerfulness and obedience they received and submitted to our orders, and betook themselves to that service which we directed as most convenient and behoofeful at that time to us, though attended with inconvenience enough to themselves, which demeanour of theirs cannot but be thought very worthy of our protection, justice, and favour."—*Ireland's Case Stated*, p. 70. The above passages specially refer to the ensign men, or those who carried the King's ensigus in foreign countries, during his exile. The slightest compensation in land, or in any other way they never received, although they had served the King as well as the "forty-nine officers" about whose claims Carte and others wax so eloquent, and who were so well provided for; but the ensign men had one fault that could not be forgiven—they were papists. It may seem odd that Charles with his leaning to Catholicity, did not try to keep his word with them. To this the answer is—he was too indolent and devoid of principle to do so.

Ireland he held two Synods and two ordinations, and, "in a month and a half administered confirmation to more than ten thousand persons;" adding that he believed there still remained throughout his Province, more than fifty thousand persons to be confirmed. On the 15th of December, 1673, he makes this announcement to the Secretary of Propaganda:—"During the past four years I confirmed fifty-eight thousand six hundred and fifty-five."

Lord Berkley was appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in 1670. He was a mild, tolerant man, and restrained the persecuting spirit of the Parliament. Hence he did not win the support of those who called themselves "the English interest in Ireland;" and they had influence enough to have him recalled after a brief government of two years. He was succeeded by the Earl of Essex. Dr. Plunket had more than once foretold that his removal would be the signal for a renewal of persecution. It accordingly came in 1674, when all the bishops and regular clergy were ordered to quit the kingdom. Many did so, but Dr. Plunket and his friend Dr. Brennan remained in a place of concealment. The persecution did not continue much over a year; but it was renewed with increased activity in 1678. Those who held possession of the Irish soil by a doubtful tenure, felt their security lay in keeping the Irish Catholics (the representatives of the old proprietors) outside the pale of the law. Then as ever, the old unfailing resource, the pretended discovery of a dreadful Irish plot to raise a rebellion, destroy the Protestants, and seize the country, was once again resorted to. Nor did it disappoint the expectations of its concocters; one of its successes, amongst many others, being to bring the saintly primate of Ireland to the scaffold.

Facts which the trial of Dr. Plunket brought to light, revealed a state of things in the Irish Church of the time, which were calculated to produce sorrow in every Christian heart. His chief accusers were unworthy priests; so that he might well apply to himself the words of his Divine Master, that "his enemies were those of his own household" (Matt. x. 36); and under his sufferings, we cannot doubt but the holy man felt, with humble submission, those other words spoken in the same discourse:—"The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord." The three chief witnesses against Dr. Plunket were, John McMoyer, who was the originator of the conspiracy, an apostate friar named Hugh Duffy, both Franciscans, who had studied together in St. Isidore's, from which they had been expelled on account of their irregularities, and Edmond Murphy, a suspended secular priest. The Franciscans returned to Ireland, where they

became notorious by their many crimes. The enmity of the two was first stirred up on account of reforms which Dr. Plunket introduced into the Order in Ireland about 1673. The disturbed state of the nation for a lengthened period necessarily relaxed discipline; and when the holy prelate began to bring the members of the different Orders back to the observance of their regular rules, some who had been living free from the restraints imposed by those rules, rose up, as was natural, against the reformer.

So infamous were the characters of those three men, that Ormonde himself, no friend to Catholics, rejected their evidence; and his biographer, Carte, speaking of other trials connected with the plot in Munster, says, "in all of them the prosecutions appeared to be alike, malicious and groundless."* The notorious Shaftesbury encouraged the carrying on of this Irish popish plot, having been himself very deep in the English one, known as Titus Oates's. Some go so far as to assert that he was the inventor of it. This is Dalrymple's opinion, who says he [Shaftesbury] "framed the fiction of the popish plot in the year 1678, in order to bury the Duke [of York], and perhaps the King, under the weight of the national fear of popery." He adds in a note: "It has been much doubted whether Shaftesbury contrived the popish plot, or if he only made use of it, after it broke out. Some papers I have seen convince me he contrived it, though the persons he made use of as informers, ran beyond their instructions."†

Dr. Plunket was arrested on the 6th of December, 1679. The charges preferred against him were divided under various heads, but there was really only one charge, namely, that he was the founder and the head of a conspiracy to raise a rebellion with the object of establishing the Catholic religion in Ireland, and destroying the Protestants. The most astounding absurdities were sworn to in order to sustain this. 1. It was asserted on oath that in a letter to Mgr. Baldeschi in Rome, he assured him that 60,000 men were ready to advance the cause; 2. that he had sent a messenger to the King of France, asking him to send an army into Ireland, and take possession of the kingdom; and 3. that he had enrolled 70,000 soldiers to co-operate with the French on their landing, &c., &c.

It was arranged by the Viceroy that Dr. Plunket's trial should

* Life of Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 516.

† Review of Events after the Restoration, Vol. I., p. 46. Dublin Ed., 1773. The King once having said to Shaftesbury, "Thou art the greatest rogue in the kingdom;" he answered, bowing, "Of a subject, Sir, I believe I am."—Walpole.

be held in Dundalk. This deranged the plans of the witnesses, because they were afraid to appear in a place where their characters were known. The charges prepared by McMoyer were read, but he did not appear at the trial to confirm them. Murphy, the second witness, no sooner heard that the trial was to be held in Dundalk, than he fled out of the country. The persecution of delay and expense alone was dreadful for Dr. Plunket, who was very poor. He produced thirty-two witnesses in Dundalk "prepared to falsify," as he writes, "all that the friar [McMoyer] had sworn;" but nothing was gone into, as neither McMoyer nor his associates appeared. The prisoner should have been then and there discharged. But no; McMoyer, knowing no Irish jury, Protestant or Catholic, would believe him on his oath, petitioned the King to have the prosecution transferred to London, and the petition was granted, no doubt, by the management and influence of Shaftesbury. At this new and hostile tribunal, Dr. Plunket had to appear without any of his witnesses, for none of them had arrived. He asked a postponement even for ten days (not much in those times) that some of his witnesses might have time to arrive, but he was refused, and had to take his trial at once and defend himself as best he could, before men, who acted as counsel for the prosecution, rather than as judges. Dr. Plunket was tried on the charge of high treason, and, having been pronounced guilty, was executed at Tyburn, on the 11th of July, 1681. What a judicial murder! The world has been filled with the savage cruelty of Judge Jeffreys, but who can point out in "the bloody assizes" so dreadful a case as Dr. Plunket's? Whilst in prison, Dr. Plunket prepared a careful defence of himself, and left it with his friends, written by his own hand. This document is well known as "the speech of the Most Rev. Dr. Plunket before his execution." Most Rev. Dr. Moran gives it in his life of the prelate from the printed copy in the Archives of Propaganda. The scattered members of the martyr were collected at the place of execution, and buried in St. Giles's, whence they were translated about the month of March, 1684, to the Benedictine Monastery of Lambispring, in Germany. His head is preserved in the Dominican Convent at Drogheda.*

* I give the following Protestant testimony on the trial and execution of Most Rev. Dr. Plunket:—"There is something odd enough in the sending for such numbers of miserable wretches from Ireland, to serve in England for witnesses of a plot, of which they knew nothing, till they were instructed by Mr. Hetherington, Lord Shaftesbury's chief agent in managing and providing for them . . . It is still more odd, that when these fellows, who went out of their own country poor and half naked, returned thither again well equipped in clothes and flush of money, having met with plentiful contributions and ample rewards for

what they had been there taught to depose, they should yet have no contributions made, no rewards given them, nor be at all considered by the Protestants of Ireland, who were particularly interested in the matter of those men's depositions, and whose throats (it was pretended) were by their discoveries saved from being cut by the papists."—Carte's Ormonde, Vol. II., p. 517.

"The jury [at Dundalk], even in these days of passionate credulity, would not find a bill against Plunket. But the informers gained some accomplices, they framed their accusation anew, and made another attack. Plunket was accused of obtaining his title and station for the purpose, and on the express compact, of raising 70,000 men in Ireland by the contributions of the popish clergy, whose whole revenues could not equip a single regiment. This formidable body of insurgents was destined to join 20,000 men, to be furnished by France, and who were to make their descent at the port of Carlingford, a place the most inconvenient, and even impossible for the purpose."—Leland's Ireland, Vol. III., p. 481.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE plan of this work does not require us to deal at much length with the reign of James II. His brother Charles and himself, being the sons of a Catholic princess, who had almost the sole management of their education, naturally inclined towards her religion. Charles, for political reasons, concealed his Catholicity, sanctioned many persecuting laws against his Catholic subjects, and gave his full approval to their being put in force in all their rigour. As Burnet says of him, he concealed his religious views to the last, and was not formally received into the Catholic Church until he was on his death-bed. James was known to be a Catholic before he came to the throne, for he took no pains to conceal the religion which he openly practised on becoming King. On the second Sunday after the death of Charles, James, in opposition to the advice of the Council, ordered the folding doors of the Queen's Chapel to be thrown open, that his presence at Mass might be noticed by the attendants in the ante-chamber.* This proceeding, as he seems to have wished, was noised abroad, and at once created a strong Protestant feeling against him. A few days previously, he had declared in his speech to the Council, that he "knew the principles of the Church of England, and that they were for monarchy, and that the members of it had always shown themselves good and loyal subjects; therefore that he should always take care to defend and support it." But these words were regarded as meant to quiet their fears, which they did not and could not be expected to do, in presence of the fact of his assisting publicly at the celebration of Mass. Everyone knew well enough before that James was a declared Catholic, but this bold and public profession of his religion, in so short a time after his accession, was what aroused their fears. Those fears soon died away, but fresh causes arose time after time to renew and intensify them. On Holy Thursday, the King went in considerable state to receive the Blessed Sacrament; and on Easter Sunday he went to Mass, attended by the Knights of the Garter in their collars.

* This was Mary Beatrice, daughter of the Duke of Modena. She was his second wife, his first being Anne Hyde, the daughter of Lord Chancellor Clarendon, who died in 1671.

When James became King of England, his position was one of the most anomalous kind. He was a Catholic, while the professors of his religion were subject to many pains and penalties for the profession of it ; so that in a certain sense he was an outlaw in the Kingdom which he was called to govern. What was he to do ? Was he to appeal to a Protestant Parliament, which hated his religion most intensely, to repeal all the persecuting laws that affected him and his co-religionists ? It would do nothing of the kind. Was he, on the broad enlightened principle of religious liberty, to ask them to free from those laws every religion within the realm ; or was he, as King, to call upon his Parliament to repeal, in his own favour only, the penal laws which affected him as a Catholic, and submit to their remaining in full force against his co-religionists and others ? Every affirmative decision would lead to the gravest difficulties, except, perhaps, the one regarding himself ; but he could not honourably seek for himself concessions which he was not prepared to extend to others. He chose a course which, although unconstitutional, was not without extenuating circumstances ; he, without seeking the authority of Parliament, liberated from prison all those of every religion who had been incarcerated for conscience' sake. It was a short but high-handed way of doing a just and generous act, and, no doubt, corresponded best with James's own estimate of his power and authority as King. He seems to have made up his mind, that the sooner he showed decision and determination in this matter the better. At the time of Charles's death, there were numbers of Catholics and Dissenters in prison under the laws of Recusancy, and the matter was actually before the law officers of that day ; but James, without awaiting tedious discussions and legal decisions, "gave it in charge to the judges to discourage prosecutions on matters of religion, and ordered by proclamation, the discharge of all persons confined for the refusal of the oaths of allegiance and supremacy. In consequence the Dissenters enjoyed a respite from the prosecution which they suffered under the Convention Act ; and Catholics to the amount of some thousands, Quakers to the amount of twelve hundred, were liberated from confinement."*

The Catholic Religion was at this time a perfect abomination to the Protestants of England of every sect. They would not examine it, they would not allow themselves to think of it, except with horror ; it was an invention of the Evil one—cursed of God, a thing to be hated and uprooted by all good men. Indeed

* Lingard, Vol. X., p. 63.

hatred of Popery formed a considerable part of the creed of the Protestants of those times, as well as of other times; so that nothing a Catholic King could do would please them. So far from it, his best intentioned acts were sure to be misrepresented. And this liberation of persons suffering in prison for their religion was turned against James, not so much because it was unconstitutional, as because they affected to regard it as a clever device to favour those of his own creed, and as a sure sign that it was the first move in a plan for overturning the Protestant religion in England. The various bodies of Nonconformists received the boon with gratitude. Anabaptists, Quakers, &c., and lastly the Catholics crowded round the King to give expression to their gratitude; the Catholics expressing their satisfaction that His Majesty's generosity was extended to all Christians. Almost immediately, great numbers deserted the Episcopalian communion, who had only joined it to avoid persecution, and as soon as they found they could return with security to their own Churches and Conventicles, they did so. The Episcopalian clergy were seized with alarm; they attacked the King's liberality as a hypocritical design to deceive the Dissenters, make a breach between them and the Episcopalians, and so weaken them by division, that in a certain time he might be strong enough to crush both, and set up Popery in their place. The terror of Popery which was instilled into the minds of the Dissenters in their childhood was revived by the arguments and pamphlets and sermons of the Episcopalian clergy. Their gratitude to the King for setting so many of their co-religionists at liberty cooled down; they were won over to the views of the Episcopalians, forgetting, or seeming to forget, that it was those very Episcopalians who had them in jail when the King set them free, and that, if he intended and actually carried out all the Episcopalians asserted of him, they could be scarcely treated more harshly by him than they had been by the men through whose reasoning they were induced to turn against the King.* Such a bugbear is Popery to the English Protestant mind. One of the things said by the Episcopalians against James was, that he was not a real friend to civil and religious liberty, that he only pretended to be such. The assumption contained in this assertion is, that they were the real friends to civil and religious liberty. Yet the astounding fact that neither Catholic nor

* In the next reign the Episcopalians proved how hollow their professions to the Dissenters were. When William was made King he endeavoured to get concessions for the Dissenters, but the proposals were opposed and defeated by the Episcopalians because the assistance of the Dissenters against Popery, and in defence of liberty, was no longer needed.—Dalrymple, Vol. I., p. 356.

Dissenter could hold a civil office without taking oaths which would be a denial of their religion stared them in the face, as did the still more astounding fact, that the thousands liberated by James's Proclamation were persons incarcerated for conscience' sake, by those pretenders to civil and religious liberty ! But blindest of all were the Dissenters who listened to their persecutors, and permitted themselves to be influenced if not convinced by them.

It would serve no useful end to discuss the question as to whether James was a hypocrite or not. What may be fairly said is, that if he were such, no hypocrite ever profited so little by his hypocrisy. All his troubles, and finally the loss of his crown, might seem to have occurred through the want of hypocrisy rather than through the employment of it. An adept in that art plays the character whenever his interests can be served by it. Why did James not pretend to become a Protestant, and allege that he was convinced it was the proper religion for a King of England ? Had he done so, there is little reason for believing that he would have lost his crown ; nay, there is evidence enough to show he would have been a popular Monarch, and regarded as a worthy successor to his father, whom the Episcopalians had begun to call Charles the martyr. It is hard to imagine a man acting so much against his interests as James, unless he believed he was acting on some principle for which it was worth his while to make sacrifices.*

Mr. Fox informs us that Hume, imperfectly informed on the subject, says, James found himself under the necessity of forming a union with the King of France, because " he alone would assist him in promoting the Catholic Religion in England."†

Mr. Fox dissents from this, and seems to give much better

* Sir John Reresby relates in his Memoirs, that after James had fled from England on William's arrival, Lord Danby said to him, " That, if King James would quit his priests, he might still retrieve his affairs."—*Dalrymple's Memoirs*, Vol. I., p. 343. His son, by his second marriage, nicknamed by his enemies the Pretender, but called by his supporters, James III., made the same sacrifice for his religion that his father had done. The Jacobites were anxious he would temporize, and cited the example of Charles the II., his uncle. His sister Queen Anne, who hated the Hanoverian succession, was most anxious to sustain his claim as her successor ; and but that she died somewhat unexpectedly, there are good grounds for believing she would have permitted him to take up his residence in Scotland, as presumptive heir to the crown. . . . "The Jacobites continued their intrigues in Great Britain, with unabated diligence, and entertained great hopes of success. The nation owed the disappointment of their schemes to the timidity of their leaders, and the enthusiasm of the Pretender himself, in adhering to the Romish faith, contrary to the advice of all his friends." *Stuart Papers*, M'Pherson, Vol. 2, (labelled on back Vol. 4), p. 364.

† Reign of James II., p. 101.

reason for the course pursued by James than the mere desire of promoting the interests of the Catholic Religion. "A connection with France," continues Mr. Fox, "was, as well in point of time, as in importance, the first object of his reign, and that the immediate specific motive to that connection, was the same as that of his brother, the desire of rendering himself independent of Parliament, and absolute, not that of establishing Popery in England, which was considered as a more remote contingency ;* that this was the case, is evident from all the circumstances of the transaction, and especially from the zeal with which he was served in it by Ministers who were never suspected of any leaning towards Popery, and not one of whom [Sunderland excepted] could be brought to the measures that were afterwards taken in favour of that religion. It is the more material to attend to this distinction, because the Tory historians, especially such of them as are not Jacobites, have taken much pains to induce us to attribute the violences and illegalities of this reign to James's religion, which was peculiar to him, rather than to that desire of absolute power, which so many other princes have had, have and always will have, in common with him. The policy of such misrepresentation is obvious. If this reign is to be considered as a period insulated, as it were, and unconnected with the general course of history, and if the events of it are to be attributed exclusively to the particular character and particular attachments of the monarch, the sole inference will be, that we must not have a Catholic for our King ; whereas, if we consider it, which history well warrants us to do, as a part of that system which had been pursued by all the Stuart Kings, as well prior as subsequent to the Restoration, the lesson which it affords is very different, and far more instructive. We are taught, generally, the dangers Englishmen will always be liable to, if, from favour to a prince upon the throne, or from a confidence, however grounded, that his views are agreeable to our own notions of the constitution, we, in any considerable degree abate of that vigilant and unremitting jealousy of the power of the crown, which can alone secure to us the effect of those wise laws that have been provided for the benefit of the subject ; and still more particularly, that it is vain to think of making a compromise with power, and by yielding to it in other points, preserving some favourite object, such, for instance, as the Church in James's case, from its grasp."†

* Appendix.

† Ibid, pp, 102-3.

Speaking of the Cameronians, and the massacre of fanatics in Scotland, Mr. Fox further observes:—"From the summary review of the affairs of Scotland, and from the complacency with which James looks back to his own share of them, joined to the general approbation he expressed of the conduct of the government in that kingdom, we may form a pretty just notion, as well of his maxims of policy, and of his temper and disposition, in matters where his bigotry to the Roman Catholic religion had no share. For it is to be observed, and carefully kept in mind, that the Church, of which he not only recommends the support, but which he showed himself ready to maintain by the most violent means, is the Episcopalian Church of the Protestants; that the test which he enforced at the point of the bayonet was a Protestant test, so much so indeed, that he himself could not take it; and that the most marked character of the Conventicles, the objects of his persecution, was not so much that of heretics excommunicated by the Pope, as of dissenters from the Church of England, and irreconcilable enemies to the Protestant Liturgy and the Protestant Episcopacy. . . . The next important observation that occurs, and to which even they who are most determined to believe that this Prince had always Popery in view, and held every other consideration as subordinate to that primary object, must nevertheless subscribe is, that the most confidential advisers, as well as the most furious supporters, of the measures we have related, were not Roman Catholics. Lauderdale and Queensbury were both Protestants. There is no reason, therefore, to impute any of James's violence afterwards to the suggestions of his Catholic advisers, since he who had been engaged in the series of measures above related, with Protestant counsellors and coadjutors, had surely nothing to learn from Papists, (whether priests, Jesuits, or others), in the science of tyranny."*

This testimony from Charles James Fox is valuable for more than one reason. 1. The Tories of his day, like the Tories of ours, were the representatives and embodiment of the principles on which the government of the Stuart dynasty was conducted. William of Orange, who dethroned his father-in-law, James II., and succeeded him as King of England, was brought to England and supported there by the Whigs, and Fox was one of the most famous Whig statesmen of his own or any other generation; so that his party feelings would lead him to be severe on James, and favourable to William. 2. The English historians who wrote of James before Fox's time, attributed all James's acts to a

* *Reign of James II.*, by C. J. Fox, pp. 123, 124, 125.

fixed purpose of destroying the Protestant religion in his dominions, and of setting up Popery in its stead; but that historian, with the nobleness of character which was so peculiarly his, set all those aside, examined James's career and motives for himself, and in spite of party bias set down the conclusions at which he had arrived, and which are given above in his own words.*

After reigning nearly four years, James fled from England in less than two months after the arrival of the Prince of Orange. He sailed from Rochester on the 23rd December, 1688, and in two days landed at Ambleteuse on the coast of France, whence he hastened to St. Germain's to join the Queen and the infant prince. In little more than a year after this, on the 12th March, 1689, he landed with some French and Irish soldiers at Kinsale. With Tirconnell, the Lord Lieutenant, who met him at Cork, he hastened to Dublin, where he set up his government, and called a Parliament.

The chief book on James the Second's rule in this country is one entitled "The State of the Protestants of Ireland under the late King James's Government." It seems to have been printed wholesale, for copies of the various editions of it are still to be met with in great plenty, at auctions and on book-stalls, and can be purchased for a mere trifle. But it is not a history of the period at all. It is a carefully prepared indictment drawn up against James, and all who acted under him here. The headings of the chapters and sections show, in a striking manner, Dr. King's *animus*, and the points he seeks to establish. The following are some of them: "King James designed to destroy the Protestant Religion, the liberty and the property of his subjects in general, the English interest in particular, and so alter the very frame and constitution of the government."—Chap. II. Sect. II. Then comes a section: "Showing from the obligations of his religion, that King James designed to destroy us,"—Sect. IV., with "The same destructive designs against his subjects, proved from the qualifications of the officers employed by King James."—Sect. VII. Next we have "King James had

* Unlike Burke, Fox was singularly careless about his posthumous fame, yet it has never grown dim. Posterity, however, has been a great loser by this carelessness of his, for we have thereby lost anything approaching complete reports of his great oratorical efforts. Burke called him "the greatest debater the world ever saw." Sir James MacIntosh said of him, that he was "the most Demosthenian speaker since Demosthenes." And Lord John Russell scarcely does him full justice, when he says of him, that he was a man of "singular candour, boldness, simplicity, and kindness of character." *Preface to Memorials and Correspondence.*

gotten a sett of officers fitted to destroy a kingdom, by reason of their loose principles, and want of moral honesty."—Sect. VIII. "King James's officers were of such a genius and inclination, as led them to destroy the laws, liberties, and religion of the kingdom." "King James not only designed, but attempted, and made a considerable progress in our destruction."—Chap. III. Sect. VII. "King James's destructive proceedings against the liberties of his Protestant subjects" are also mentioned.—Sect. XIV. "Ninthly, showing King James's methods for destroying the Protestant religion," may conclude our extracts.

Dr. King's Bill of Indictment against James is based upon an assumption of the most absurd and ridiculous kind, which is, 1. *That the Protestants are the people of Ireland*, that they were in possession of the country time out of mind, and that James and the Papists were wicked intruders who rushed in upon them, and proceeded to rob, plunder, and oppress those ancient and rightful owners, and to stamp out their religion. To anyone who has read the account of the Cromwellian Settlement, and Charles the Second's Act of Settlement, given above, no word is needed of explanation or reply to Dr. King's surprising assumption. 2. Another assumption, we cannot call it a principle, which runs through his book is, that it is only the persecution of Episcopalian Protestants which is a crime, and that what he calls liberty is only intended for them. The savage butcheries perpetrated by Cromwell at Drogheda and Wexford, the wholesale murder of not only innocent men, but of women and children by the Cootes, and hundreds of similar villanies committed by Ireton, and Broghill, and Murrough O'Brien, the house-burner, aye, and by the less notorious Ludlow, are things passed over by Dr. King as requiring no defence, and are not so much as alluded to for the purpose of explaining or extenuating the acts of the Irish. They were regarded, as right and proper, I suppose, because they were done to promote the "English interest" in Ireland. But when a change comes which is distasteful to Dr. King, and the real owners of the soil of Ireland endeavour to recover a portion of it, he cannot contain his rage and indignation against James and his instruments.

Dr. King writes as an enthusiastic lover of liberty, whilst, like others who have done likewise, he was the steadfast upholder of persecuting laws, not only against Papists, for that was a matter of course, but against Protestant Dissenters. Some of the things he has said in praise of liberty are really beautiful. Here is one of them:—"There is no worldly thing more valuable to a man than liberty. Many prefer it to life; and few can live long without it. 'Tis the darling of our laws, and there is nothing

of which they are more tender.”* How charming! In the reign of George I. a Toleration Bill was brought into the Irish Parliament (which was eventually passed) to relieve the Dissenters from some of the most oppressive pains and penalties under which they suffered, but one of the most active opponents of that bill was Archbishop King. Not only did he battle against it here, but through the Archbishop of Canterbury, stirred up English feeling and prejudice with the hope of having it rejected. He was very downcast when it became law. Writing to the Archbishop of Canterbury, on 10th November, 1719, he says:—“Our Toleration bill passed after long and warm debates. . . . The bill could not have passed if our brethren who came to us from your side of the water, had not deserted us, and gone over to the adverse party. I fear we shall all feel the effects of it; and in truth I can’t see how our Church can stand here, if God do not, by a peculiar and unforeseen providence, support it.”†

“The Acts for the uniformity of Common Prayer, of the 2nd of Elizabeth, and of the 17th and 18th of King Charles II., were those from the penalties of which exemption was thus provided for Protestants dissenting from the Church of Ireland. By the former of these, all persons were required to resort to their parish church [the Protestant Episcopal Church], every Sunday and holiday, during divine service, upon pain of forfeiting twelve-pence for non-attendance; and by the latter, every dissenting minister was liable to a penalty of £100 for officiating in any congregation. But by this Act, such penalties were taken off from Protestant dissenters, provided they should take the oaths of allegiance and abjuration, and *make and subscribe the declaration against transubstantiation*; provided also, that no assembly for religious worship should be had in any place with the doors locked, barred, or bolted; and that all laws for frequenting divine service on Sundays be still in force and executed against offenders, unless they resorted to some assembly of religious worship allowed by this Act. The like benefits were *extended to Quakers*, on their making and subscribing a declaration professing fidelity to the King, and *disbelief in the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome, as superstitious and idolatrous*; but no benefit was thereby given to any person professing the Popish religion.”‡

* King’s State of the Protestants, &c. Chap. III., Sect. VII.

† Quoted in the History of the Church of Ireland, &c. By the Right Rev. Richard Mant, D.D., Lord Bishop of Down and Connor, Vol. II., p. 337.

‡ Ibid, pp. 342, 343. The Italics in the above quotation are mine.—J. O’R.

Bishop Burnet seems to have had an extremely high opinion of the "State of the Protestants," &c., by Dr. King, for he says of it in a letter to Sir Robert Southwell, "that it is not only the best book that hath been written for the service of the government; but without any figure, it is worth all the rest put together—and will do more than all our scribblings for settling the minds of the nation."* It must, however, be borne in mind that Burnet was one of the earliest and most pronounced partizans of William of Orange; he had lived for a considerable time in Holland in the most confidential intercourse with that prince before his invasion of England, and actually landed at Torbay with him as one of his chaplains.† Other Protestant dignitaries do not seem to have set so much value on Dr. King's "State of the Protestants" as Bishop Burnet. For instance, Dr. Mant devotes a great deal of space to the life and episcopate of Dr. King, his name occurring no less than a hundred and sixty times in his history, often with expressions of great admiration for him, but nowhere with even the most casual allusion to his "State of the Protestants of Ireland under King James's Government."

The most prominent political character in Ireland during James the Second's unhappy reign, was Richard Talbot, Duke of Tirconnell. He was born at Carton, near Maynooth (then the family residence of the Talbots). Early in the seventeenth century he was with the army which defended Drogheda against Cromwell, where his life was saved by a Parliamentary officer named Reynolds. He escaped to Flanders, and entered the service of James, then Duke of York. He was an impulsive man, often overbearing in his manner, but had also good qualities, so that his character seems fairly given by a contemporary, who says of him, that "he was ever ready to speak bold, offensive truths, and to do good offices."‡ And this is well exemplified by the fact, that he was committed to the Tower for using threatening words to the Duke of Ormonde regarding the Act of Explanation; but indeed it would be very hard for any Irish Catholic to keep his temper, in speaking of that iniquitous Act, and of Ormonde's guilty connection with it.‡ He was made a Lieutenant-General by James, when he came to the throne, and in announcing the appointment, the King said apologetically, that "to mitigate a little the cruel oppression the Catholics had so long groaned

* Harris's Ware, Bishops, p. 336.

† Burnet's Hist. of his Own Time, *temp.* James II.

‡ Quoted in Webb's Compendium of Irish Biography, *Art.* Richard Talbot, Duke of Tirconnell.

under in that kingdom [Ireland], he thought it no injury to others, that they who had tasted so deeply of his sufferings should now, in his prosperity, have a share at least of his protection;" and from other considerations he thought it "necessary to give a commission of Lieutenant-General to Colonel Richard Talbot, a gentleman of an ancient family in that kingdom, a man of good abilities and clear courage, and one who for many years had a true attachment to his Majesty's person and interest."* He was made Lord Lieutenant in February, 1687.

Archbishop King evidently set himself the task of ruining the character of Tirconnell. He says his usual arts were "falsehood, dissimulation and flattery, which he practised with the deepest oaths and curses."† He was, he says, usually styled "lying Dick Talbot." It is a clever, but a very old trick to give the man you wish to damage a bad name, with the design that his character may be inferred from it; but if any impartial investigator will take the trouble to read King's "State of the Protestants" by the light of Leslie's Answer to it, he will be forced to the conclusion, that the offensive epithet above applied to the peer is, to say the least, equally applicable to the prelate. But there is this difference between the so-called lies of Tirconnell and the misstatements of Dr. King; the former come down to us only by tradition, and chiefly on the authority of Dr. King, Tirconnell's pronounced enemy, whilst the misstatements of Dr. King himself are to be found in his book, standing against him in thousands of copies of it. "I must," says Leslie, "do that justice even to the Lord Tyrconnell, that I have heard several Irish Protestants say that the objections they had against him were for his carriage towards them before the beginning of the Revolution, but that afterwards he managed with moderation and prudence, showing more favour to the Protestants than they expected. And that he was against repealing the Act of Settlement."‡

A well-known Irish Protestant Lady and authoress, Lady Morgan, says of Tirconnell: "Much ill has been written and more believed; but his history has only been written by the pen of party steeped in gall, and copied servilely from the pages of prejudice by the lame historians of modern times, more anxious

* Ulster Journal of Archæology, Belfast, 1853-62. Quoted by Mr. Webb *loc. cit.*

† State of the Protestants, &c., p. 84. Dublin, 1713.

‡ Answer to King, p. 73. This statement about the Act of Settlement is very remarkable, as Tirconnell is said by his enemies to have been violently for its repeal.

for authority than for authenticity. Two qualities he possessed in an eminent degree—wit and valour; and if to gifts so brilliant and so Irish, he joined devotion to his country, and fidelity to the unfortunate and fated family with whose exile he began his life, and with whose ruin he finished it, it cannot be denied that in his character the elements of evil were mixed with much great and striking good.”*

The Duke of Berwick assures us that “he was a man of much worth, although not of a military genius; that his firmness preserved Ireland after the invasion of the Prince of Orange; and that he nobly rejected every offer that had been made to him to submit.”†

The compliment of loyalty to the man he had sworn allegiance to is well deserved by Tirconnell; but Dr. King and his many other enemies refused to see any virtuous quality whatever in him. At any rate, to suffer for the sake of loyalty was no part of their system. They trimmed on every occasion, their whole aim being to stand well with the ruling powers—a system which, although disreputable for its want of principle, gives more chances of success than any other. Dr. King himself was a Tory, as long as Toryism was in the ascendant, and seemed likely to remain so. He as well as others of the same stamp “preached passive obedience in their pulpits in Dublin to that degree as to give offence to some of their Protestant hearers, who thought they stretched it even to flattery.”‡ But when James’s fortunes began to wane, Dr. King thought it time to prepare for his fall and went to promote it, for whilst yet under his protection, he was more than suspected of sending frequent intelligence by one Sherman to Schomberg, and others in London. This would have been called treason in these days, and the “bloody-minded tyrant [one of Dr. King’s epithets for James] would have found another remedy than short imprisonment.”§

* Quoted in Webb’s *Compendium of Irish Biography*, *Art.* Richard Talbot, Duke of Tirconnell.

† *Memoires de Maréchal de Berwick*, Tome I., 103.

‡ Leslie’s *Answer*, &c. Preface to the Reader.

§ See Leslie.

Charles Leslie (or Leasley) was second son of Leslie, Bishop of Clogher. “He opposed the claims of the Catholics during James II.’s sojourn in Ireland, but steadily refused to take the oaths to King William and Queen Mary; for this he was deprived of his preferments, and he became the virtual head of the non-juring party.” His answer to Dr. King was published anonymously in London in 1692, the MS. of which had been for a considerable time finished, but remained unpublished from the difficulty of finding a publisher; all to whom he applied, fearing the danger of a prosecution had they undertaken the publication.

Dr. King does not seem to have been brought to trial; it must therefore be said that he was not convicted of betraying James. But there must have been strong reasons for putting in prison a man who was such a supporter of James's, and had preached passive obedience for a long time so thoroughly. Moreover, considering the promotion he received from William, that cool, unimpassioned man must have been satisfied that he had done him important services. When the See of Derry became vacant by the death of Walker, at the battle of the Boyne, Dr. King was appointed to it. In 1693, William and Mary made him a regal visitor, together with the Bishops of Meath and Dromore. In a few years after (1703), he was raised to the dignity of Archbishop of Dublin. He filled the office of Lord Justice on four occasions. He ambitioned the primacy, and expected it almost as a matter of course, on the death of Primate Lindsay; but Boulter was appointed, the reason probably being, that his friend, William III. had been long dead, and George the I. reigned (1724), when the vacancy occurred. He was chagrined by the refusal, and by the reason given for it, namely, his age. He evidently did not think the reason a good one, although he was seventy-four at the time.

But the loyalty of the whole Protestant party in Ireland was quite as versatile as that of Dr. King—nay, even more so. Thus writes Leslie about it:—"Before the association in the North of Ireland, September, 1688, they prayed for King James. The beginning of March following, they proclaimed the Prince of Orange King, and prayed for him. The 15th day, King James's army broke their forces at Drommore in the North of Ireland, and reduced all but Derry and Enniskillen. Then they prayed again for King James, *that God would strengthen him to vanquish and overcome all his enemies*. In August following, Schomberg went over with an English army; then *as far as his quarters reached*, they returned to pray the same prayer for King William; the rest of the Protestants praying for victory to King James and for his people; and yet now tell us, that all the while they meant the

He was one of the ablest religious controversialists of his own or any generation. Swift, in his Preface to Burnet's Introduction to his History of the Reformation, says of him:—"Without doubt Mr. Lesley is unhappily misled in his politics; but he has given the world such a proof of his soundness in religion, as many a bishop ought to be proud of. . . . It is some mortification to me when I see an avowed non-juror contribute more to the confounding of Popery, than could ever be done by an hundred thousand such introductions." William III. was a great friend of Swift's, and often consulted him. Leslie is well-known to most Catholics by his "Case stated between the Church of Rome and the Church of England," which called forth the famous Answer of Father R. Manning.

same thing : four times in one year, praying forwards and backwards, point blank contradictory to one another.”*

There is one explanation, and but one for this unprincipled behaviour. The Protestant party in Ireland were determined, under all circumstances, to usurp the name and position of loyalists, to the exclusion of the Irish Catholics, who, *under all circumstances*, were to be regarded and treated as rebels. This was a most convenient arrangement for the Protestant party, because rebels have no rights. And to this hour the same system is carried out as far as it can be.

Dr. King details at considerable length the seizure of the Protestant churches in Ireland by the Catholics, during James's sojourn here. “Everywhere Protestant churches were taken from them by force, and given to Popish priests by the order or connivance of the King.” No doubt there is some cause for this complaint, but Dr. King is such a partisan and exaggerator that we cannot accept his statements as wholly correct, and he does not even hint that the Catholics regarded most of the churches as their own, as they had been *violently* seized by the Protestants not long before. Even on Dr. King's own showing, James was against the seizure of the churches by the Catholics. He published a proclamation against it, and commanded that a stop should be put to it. Dr. King attributes bad and hypocritical motives to him in issuing this proclamation ; and yet he is obliged to admit that “the mayors and officers refused to obey his order.” So far from sympathising with the King for his want of power to enforce this order, he seems rather to rejoice at it, saying that he [James] “now found how precariously he reigned in Ireland.”† On this question of the seizure of churches by the Catholics, Leslie replies :—“Dr. King cannot name one Protestant church in Ireland that was taken from them [the Protestants], either by King James's order or connivance, which is so far from the truth that Dr. King himself gives instances to the contrary, and tells how King James did struggle against the popish clergy in behalf of the Protestants, and turned out the Mayor of Wexford, for not obeying his Majesty's orders in restoring the Protestants the church there which the popish clergy had usurped ; and that he appeared most zealous to have the church restored, and expressed

* Answer to King. A great partisan of William's says substantially the same thing :—“They published a declaration full of loyalty to King James, before they knew he had retired, praying for long dominion to a Prince who had already resigned it.”—Dalrymple's *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. I., p. 332. Dublin Ed., 1773.

† State of the Protestants, &c., Chap. III., Sect. XVIII. (especially n. 11.)

himself with more passion than was usual upon that occasion.”*

Dr. King's matter-of-course assumption (from which he never swerves) is, that James had no subjects in Ireland but the Protestants. In the heading of his second chapter he says:—“King James designed to destroy the Protestant religion, the *liberty and property of his subjects in general*,” &c. I have seen it stated on good authority that at the time James was in Ireland the proportion of Catholics to Protestants was as six to one of the population; but the number of Catholics as compared with Episcopalian Protestants (the only genuine Protestants according to Dr. King) was very much greater. Let us, however, take Petty's estimate. His “Political Anatomy of Ireland” bears date 1672. In that work he says the “present population of British is as three to eleven.” Taking the British to mean Protestants, and all the rest Catholics, which will be substantially correct, we have in round numbers four Catholics to one Protestant in Ireland, nearly twenty years before James landed here. All these Dr. King ignores as if they did not exist.† In his second chapter he says:—“King James not only designed but attempted, and made considerable progress in our destruction.” Sect. vii. of the same chapter is written to show his destructive proceedings against the liberties of his Protestant subjects. Sect. xiv. is intended “to show his methods for destroying the Protestant religion.” With regard to these charges it may be said, in the first place, that James was an avowed Catholic, and although Dr. King ignored the existence of such beings in Ireland, he could not expect James to do so. The Protestants (Dr. King amongst them) were in active correspondence with William at the time James arrived in Ireland, and previous to it, many of them maintaining that it was sinful to yield allegiance to a popish sovereign. When James became acquainted with this state of things, it is natural to suppose he would be on his guard, yet to the last he seems to have been kind to them, and to have shown a disposition to conciliate them. Leslie says:—“After King James came in person into Ireland, there was not an act which could be properly called his, that was not all mercy

* Leslie's Answer to King, Preface to the reader. As to Christ's Church in Dublin it was taken for the King's own use, and was always reputed as the King's chapel.—*Ibid.*

† See Political Anatomy, p. 18.

It is related of Lord Clonmell, Chief Justice of the King's Bench, that a witness having said, casually, one day in his Court, that he (the witness) was a Roman Catholic, his Lordship indignantly told him that the law did not suppose there was any such being in Ireland as a Roman Catholic. Lord Clonmell died only in 1798. How long the fiction was kept up!

and goodness to the Protestants ; and as many of them as do retain the least sense of gratitude, acknowledge it, of which you will see several instances in clearing the matters of fact which this author produces.”*

In answer to the outcry that James intended to set up Popery in Ireland, Leslie quotes the fourth instruction of King William to his Commissioners in Scotland, dated from Copt Hall, 31st May, 1689 :—“ You are,” he says, “ to pass an Act establishing that church government which is most agreeable to the inclinations of the people.” “ By which rule,” says Leslie, “ the Jacobites say that it was as just to set up Popery in Ireland as Presbytery in Scotland ; that it was not more against the one in Ireland than against the other in Scotland,” the Catholics being the overwhelming majority in the former kingdom. It would seem that the Scotch Presbyterians in Ireland were those chiefly who maintained that they should, in conscience, refuse allegiance to James, because he was a Papist, relying on what was known in Scotland as the “ Claim of Right.” That important document opens with these words, “ Whereas King James being a professed Papist, did assume the Royal power,” &c., and the First Claim lays it down that “ by the law of this kingdom (Scotland) no Papist can be king or queen of this realm.” But curiously enough, in a still more Sacred Document, the “ Confession of Faith,” chapter 23, we read :—“ It is established as the true Christian doctrine in these words, viz. :—*Infidelity*, or indifference in religion, doth not make void the magistrates’ just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him.” So that on this important point, the Claim of Right and the Confession of Faith are sadly at variance. But if the consciences of the Presbyterians were so tender, why did they stifle their promptings and keep praying for James as long as he was successful, and return to their orthodoxy as soon as William’s fortunes were in the ascendant ?

Once again I have to quote Dr. King, in praise of that precious treasure, liberty, which is, according to his strange notions of it, to be confined to one-sixth of the people of a nation, whilst the other five-sixths are to be kept in abject slavery. “ To purchase liberty,” says Leslie,† quoting King, “ our author thinks it worth the while to cut the throats of one-half of the nation. These are his words :—‘ To lose even half the subjects in a war is more tolerable than the loss of liberty ; since if

* Answer, &c., p. 73.

† Answer to King, p. 12.

liberty and good laws be preserved, an age or two will repair the loss of subjects and improvements, though they be ever so great; but if liberty be lost it is never to be retrieved, but brings certain and infallible destruction.* Here is a terrible sentence! Only half of a nation cut down at a blow! We must expect some very good reason for this. He says, 'An age or two will repair the loss of subjects, but if liberty be lost it is never retrieved.' Now, I thought quite the contrary of this had been true. I thought men might be rescued from prison but not from death. An age or two will repair the loss of lives; that is, other men will live. But does that retrieve those that are lost? He may as well say that I regain my liberty if another man gets his liberty. But he says, if liberty be lost it is never to be retrieved. Why, then, would he sacrifice half the nation to retrieve it? He says it brings certain and infallible destruction. And will he contend against infallible destruction? I would ask whether he thinks the Irish Protestants did not lose their liberty under King James? If they did not, his whole work is false. If they did, has not King William retrieved it? If not, let him answer his thanks-giving sermon. But if King William has retrieved their lost liberty, then his position is false, viz., that if liberty be lost it is never to be retrieved."† "Sir, in this slaughter you make of bodies, there will be some souls lost: and an age or two will not repair that."‡

After the disastrous battle of the Boyne, James (having been then about six months in Ireland) proceeded to Kinsale, where he took ship for Brest, at which port he landed on the 20th of July, [old style] twenty days after the battle. From that time to his death in 1701, he resided at St. Germain's, on the bounty of Louis XIV. It should be mentioned to his credit, that his affectionate solicitude for those who remained faithful to him, and had followed him into exile, ceased only with his life. "He was very charitable, and as there were a great many of his poor, faithful subjects at St. Germain's, who had lost their fortune to follow him, he was touched with their condition, and *retrenched as much as he could to assist them*. He used to call from time to time into his cabinet, some of those bashful, indigent persons, of all ranks; to whom he distributed, folded up in small pieces of paper, 5, 10, 15, or 20 pistoles, more or less, according to the merit, the quality, and the

* King's State of the Protestants, &c., p. 4. The context shows that "civil war" is meant, although the word is not repeated in the above sentence.

† Leslie's Answer to King, p. 33.

‡ Ibid., p. 39.

exigency of each.”* He gave himself much to religious exercises in his retirement—a course worthy of approval in any Christian, but in a king especially praiseworthy. However, there is no course of life, no matter how good, that may not be contorted and misrepresented. An English writer blames and ridicules the fallen monarch for becoming pious, as if his piety were a crime, or a contemptible weakness. It is strange what effect the words, “Pope,” “Popery,” “Papist,” &c., produce on the mind of an English Protestant; staid though he be, and impartial on almost every other subject, the moment one of these words comes before him, it seems to set him on fire as a match does a magazine. You may read dozens of pages in that very useful book, Wade’s Chronology of English History, without once adverting to what the writer’s religion might be. But see how it comes out in the following passage regarding James’s mode of life in his latter years:—“Sunk into the most abject extreme of superstition, he seemed to have relinquished the hope, and almost the wish, to recover his former greatness. *He had become a Jesuit*, and rarely failed making an annual visit to the Abbey of La Trappe, practising all the austerities enjoined upon that rigid order.”†

The following is Leslie’s estimate of James’s career and character:—“I have done, when I have desired the reader not to think that I am insensible of several ill steps, which were made in the administration of affairs, under the government of King James. Nor do I design to lessen them, or make other apology for them, than by doing him this justice, to tell what the Jacobites offer to prove and make it notorious, viz.: that the greatest blots in his government were hit by those who made them, with design to ruin him, and now boast it as their merit, and are rewarded for it. And though Dr. King represents him to be so tyrannical and implacable a temper towards the Protestants, yet that it is now publicly known that the fatal measures he took were advised, and often pressed beyond and against his Majesty’s inclinations and opinion by those Protestants, whom his unexampled and even faulty clemency had not only pardoned, for all their bitter virulency in opposing his succession, but brought them into his most secret councils, and acted by their advice. This was the burthen of the charge laid against him in the Prince of Orange’s declaration, viz.: ‘Employing such ministers and acting by their advice,’ and though our law says, that the king can do no wrong, and there-

* Sir David Nairne, who was with James at St. Germain’s, quoted in O’Callaghan’s History of the Irish Brigade, p. 190, *note*.

† Wade’s British History Chronologically arranged, p. 291.

fore, that his ministers are only accountable, yet as Mr. Samuel Johnson laid it open, that we have lived to see the king only punished, and those ministers rewarded, and still employed ; and the many grievances complained of in their administration under King James are, by the present discontented, said to be continued and doubled upon us now.*

James was not a free agent in Ireland ; he was in the hands of his Irish supporters, who had remained loyal to his cause, and were now ready to shed their blood for him. Much worse, he was in the hands of secret enemies, to whom he gave his confidence, and who counselled him to do things which they hoped would lead to his ruin. He summoned a Parliament, which met on the 10th of May, 1689, and in which a bill was passed to repeal the Acts of Settlement and Explanation. That justice cried aloud for their repeal there can be no doubt, for they were framed to effect, and did effect, the wholesale plunder of that vast majority of the nation who alone remained faithful to their lawful sovereign. But the expediency of their repeal was quite another thing. All the Acts passed in this Parliament were signed by James, and this is usually put forward as a proof that he approved of the repeal of the Acts of Settlement and Explanation. But the fact was otherwise ; for he seems to have been always thoroughly opposed to their repeal. In 1685 he sent Lord Clarendon as Lord Lieutenant to Ireland, commanding him to declare on his arrival that he, the King, " would preserve the Acts of Settlement and Explanation inviolable ;" and not only was this declaration made in Council by Lord Clarendon, but it was given in charge, by him, to the judges, to repeat it from the bench on their respective circuits. Sir Charles Porter was, at the same time, sent over as Chancellor, bearing the same message from the King, with this further addition, that he, the King, would preserve those Acts as "*the Magna Charta of Ireland.*" Later on Chancellor Fitton made the same announcement, and it was often afterwards repeated. Nor does Dr. King's vulgar and offensive remark that " the Papists knew it was all colour," prove that James was insincere.

James, as we have just noted, was not a free agent in Ireland, and was obliged to manage as best he could those in whose hands he had put himself, as they were his sole supporters in the kingdom. It was on the faith of their loyalty he had come into the country, and if he did anything to provoke them to desert him, he had none but declared enemies to fall back upon. Such being his position he was obliged to act with extreme

* Leslie's Preface to his Answer to King.

caution, and of this we have a sample in his speech at the opening of the Parliament of the 10th of May, which was published by his own order. "I have," he says, "always been for liberty of conscience, and against invading any man's property; having in my mind the saying of holy writ, Do as you would be done by; for that is the law and the prophets." Again, and this is the more important passage, "I shall most readily consent to the making such good and wholesome laws as may be for the general good of the nation, the improvement of trade, and *the relieving such as have been injured by the late Acts of Settlement, as far forth as may be consistent with reason, justice, and the public good of my people.*" Relieving those injured by the Acts, and repealing them are very different things. "I appeal," says Leslie, "to the Earl of Granard, whether Duke Powis did not give him thanks from King James, for the opposition he made in the House of Lords to the passing the Act of Attainder, and the Act for repeal of the Acts of Settlement; and desired that he and the other Protestant Lords should use their endeavours to obstruct them. To which the Lord Granard answered, that they were too few to effect that; but if the King would not have them pass, his way was to engage some of the Roman Catholic Lords to stop them. To which the Duke replied with an oath, that the King durst not let them know that he had a mind to have them stopt."* This is strong evidence of James's real sentiments about the repeal of those Acts; but Dr. King and men like him would have no difficulty in putting it aside by saying it was "all colour."†

* Answer to King, p. 99.

† The Acts of this Parliament were declared to be Acts of Rebellion and Treason by 7 William III., c. 3.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE Protestantism of the Stuarts never seems to have risen to a standard high enough to satisfy the Protestants of England. James I. persecuted the Catholics in the most satisfactory manner, and robbed them of six counties in Ulster, but he was the son of a mother so Catholic, that they could not rid themselves of the notion that his Protestantism was diluted by the Catholic blood of Mary Stuart. His son Charles I. died like a Christian King and a true Protestant, but he had a Catholic wife, whose sons, it was assumed, must have an increased leaven of Popery in them. This turned out to be true; for although Charles II. concealed his religious convictions up to the time of his death, he, at the last moment, was received into the Catholic Church. But James's case was the worst of all, for he became a Catholic in his brother's lifetime, and took no pains to conceal the fact; whereas had he acted like his brother Charles, he might have lived and died King of England. And it is worthy of remark, that the man on whose grave his enemies have stamped the words "hypocrite" and "deceiver" faced any amount of unpopularity and hatred, submitted to a life of suffering and humiliation, and finally lost his crown rather than *pretend* to desert the religion which he believed to be the true one, although his brother Charles had requested him to do so. When he ascended the throne he began not only to profess, but to act with great toleration. He showed especial favour to the Dissenters, liberating hundreds of them who were in prison for their religion. For this they at first showed much gratitude, but the Episcopalian divines so wrought upon them with incessant sermons, and endless pamphlets about the dreadfulness of Popery, which, they asserted, James was about to establish as soon as he found himself strong enough, that they joined the Episcopalians against him.

The Protestants even in the lifetime of Charles II. held correspondence with William, Prince of Orange, but it was carried on with great secrecy, and under various pretences, by his agents in England. The fact is that the Protestants would not be satisfied with a Catholic King, no matter what he did for them, and such being the case, it was the natural course for them to turn to William. He was James's nephew, being the son of the Princess Mary, eldest daughter of Charles I., and had the still stronger

claim of being married to James's eldest surviving daughter, (who was also a Princess Mary), and hence heiress to the Crown of England. She had the advantage of being a Protestant like her husband. William was, moreover, regarded as the head of the Protestant interest in Europe, being almost always at war with Louis the XIV., its most powerful enemy. But the Protestants of England were not unanimous as to the terms on which they would invite William to aid them. The Tories were only for compelling James to give a parliamentary settlement for the security of the Protestant religion and the laws; in public the Whigs supported this view in a general way, but in private they went much further, maintaining that "the time was now ripe, in compliance with the voice of the people, to oblige him to descend from that throne, from which by the voices of two successive Houses of Commons, he had already been excluded."*

It is admitted on all hands that William's education was much neglected, being chiefly conducted by his grandmother, his father having died before his birth, and his mother when he was but ten years old. He learned two or three modern languages, and as much of the mathematics as was connected with military

* Dalrymple, Vol. I., p. 205. When it was known that the Duke of York had become a Catholic, his enemies lost no time in stirring up the passions of the people against him. They cried out that the church was in danger, and called for securities to protect it. Although the securities they sought affected all Catholics equally, they were chiefly directed against the Duke's succession to the throne. The first step taken towards his exclusion was the enactment of the test, which received the royal assent the 29th of March, 1673. James refused to take it, because as a Catholic he could not do so, and immediately resigned all his employments, one of them being that of high admiral. The next move was to exclude him from the House of Lords and from the councils of his brother, and consequently from the throne. They devised "a more comprehensive test," and moved that whoever refused to take it should be disabled from sitting in Parliament, and prohibited from approaching within five miles of the Court. The phrensy excited in the public mind by the astounding fabrications of Dr. Tonge and Titus Oates caused the bill enacting this test to pass through the House of Commons without opposition.—*C. Journals*, Oct. 23, 1678. But when sent to the Lords, it made but slow progress there; they regarding it as an invasion of their privileges. Its rejection was confidently expected, yet it was finally allowed to pass, with a proviso that its operation should not extend to his royal highness the Duke of York. This was disappointing to his enemies, but its general effect which remained was to exclude all Catholic peers from Parliament; an exclusion which lasted a hundred and fifty years.—*Lords Journals*, XIII., 365.

Some time after, the Duke of York's enemies entered on a bolder course; they prepared a bill to exclude him from the throne. "The plan of operations was traced by the hand of Shaftesbury, and did honour to the ingenuity of its author." A new Titus Oates appeared in the person of Dangerfield, to accuse the heir presumptive with being privy to his imposture of a Presbyterian plot. He was received at the bar of the House of Commons "with approbation and listened to with credulity," although he stood before them "with the accumulated infamy of sixteen convictions on his head;" and although his testimony

operations. Such was the whole extent of his acquirements. I find no special mention of his religious training. He was, of course, brought up in the tenets of Calvinism ; such being then the form of belief prevailing in the Netherlands. But William got an education which cannot be acquired in schools nor from books ; he was trained in adversity ; and the state of his country in his youth compelled him to apply himself to military and diplomatic affairs.

Although the leading men in England invited William to come to their assistance, their jealousy of foreign interference in their affairs soon began to show itself. While yet in Holland William had made up his mind to be nothing less than King of England, if he came at all ; and he had got Burnet, who was his close confidant there, to give theological lectures to the princess, proving, chiefly from Ephesians v. 22, that it was contrary to the word of God that a wife should be ruler over her husband, which would be the case if she accepted the crown to his exclusion, thereby leaving him in the condition of a subject. Whether Burnet succeeded in convincing the princess or not, the nation, or a large section of it, had views of its own. Some suggested a regent during King James's lifetime ; others the elevation of the princess herself to the throne ; and on the matter went until William, long suffering though he was, became wearied out with their endless debates. So he at length sent for some of the leading men and told them, (1) that if he were the person they intended for regent, he declined the office, for he would accept no dignity dependent upon the life of another ; (2) touching the project of placing the princess alone on the throne, and admitting him to a participation of power through courtesy, he said, after eulogizing her virtues, " he thought proper to let them know that he would hold no power dependent upon the will of a woman." He concluded by announcing that if either scheme were adopted he would return to his own country, " happy in the consciousness" of having done his best to serve them, although without success.† This clever stroke had the effect intended by William, and led to

had been rejected by the verdicts of three successive juries. One of his charges against his royal highness was, that he had the intention of *getting the King murdered*. Before the astonished indignation of the House at this terrible accusation had time to subside, Lord Russell rose and moved that it should be the first care of the House " effectually to suppress Popery, and prevent a Popish successor." The resolution was adopted without a dissentient voice.—*C. Jour.*, Oct. 26. Lord Russell, accompanied by the great body of the Commons, brought the bill up to the Lords, where after a debate of six hours, it was rejected by sixty-three to thirty voices.—See Lingard, Vol. IX., p. 238. Dalrymple, Vol. I.

† " All this he delivered in so cold and unconcerned a manner, that those who judged of others by the dispositions they felt in themselves, looked on it as artifice and contrivance."—Harris's Life of William III., Vol. 2, p. 160.

a sort of middle course being adopted, by which William and Mary were made joint sovereigns.*

Five weeks after this James landed at Kinsale whence he proceeded to Dublin. Although the most pressing appeals had been made to William both previous to and after that event, they remained unheeded by him. "He would scarcely listen to the accounts brought him from that country [Ireland], or see those who brought them."† "And instead of taking any soothing measures to gain Tyrconnel, the Lord Lieutenant, to his interests, or vigorous ones to frighten him from asserting those of James, he contented himself with sending over Colonel Hamilton, one of Tyrconnel's friends, the same man who had attended James in his barge to Rochester, to summon Tyrconnel to submit to the present administration. Hamilton betrayed his trust, and advised him to refuse obedience."‡ Hamilton was not the first messenger chosen by William to go to Tyrconnel. "Upon a report that Tyrconnel had proposed in the Council to make the Lords Granard and Mountjoy, both Protestants, the first Lieutenant General, the other Major General, and to restore the arms to the Protestants, it was thought fit to summon him, by a letter, to submit to the present administration, and to receive those troops which his Highness designed for the security of Ireland; assuring him that the Roman Catholics there should enjoy the same liberty they had in King Charles II.'s time. Sarsfield, a native of Ireland, was first pitched upon to carry this letter, but he told his Highness that 'he was ready to obey his commands, and even to fight against the King of France, but as to his being any ways accessory to deprive his lawful sovereign of one of his kingdoms, he would never do it, unless forced to it.' Being a brave officer, his answer was not ill received, and Colonel Hamilton, another Irishman, willingly undertook the message."§ So that each of the two messengers selected by William to bear his letter to Tyrconnel was a friend of that nobleman, and consequently devoted to the cause of James. It is hardly fair to William to accuse him of carelessness or imprudence

* The resolution as passed by the Commons was that "the Prince and Princess of Orange shall be declared King and Queen of England and of all the dominions thereunto belonging." Next day when this resolution came before it (the Lords) they explained by voting that the "sole and full regal power be in the Prince only, in name of both."—*L. Journals*, Feb. 7th, 1688-9.

† Dalrymple, Vol. I., p. 331.

‡ Ibid.

§ The History of King William the Third. London: Printed for A. Roper, at the Black-Boy in Fleet Street, 1703, Vol. I. Interregnum, p. 8.

in the choice. His habit was to act with careful deliberation, as no doubt he did in this instance, and so concluded that a friend would be better received and have more influence with Tyrconnel than a political opponent. So much in explanation of William's choice of messenger, but no defence can be made for Hamilton. He should have refused the office, as Sarsfield did, or, having accepted it, acted the part of an honourable man for William's interest.

William, agreeably to his usual custom, kept to himself his reasons for neglecting Irish affairs; so they could only be guessed at. Lord Halifax suggested that he neglected Ireland, because he was of opinion that nothing could impel the English so much to a speedy settlement of England, as to leave Ireland in an unsettled condition. Others thought that he encouraged the Irish to rebel, in order to have an opportunity of enriching his followers by their forfeitures. Others, again, found a cause of this neglect in a fear he entertained, that if he made an attempt too soon to reduce Ireland to obedience, he might be unsuccessful, and bring such disgrace on his administration as would imperil his newly acquired position in England, where he felt he had as yet no very firm foothold. Each of these conjectures is plausible enough, and taken together, perhaps they contain the whole truth; but, in fact, he was too busy in England after his arrival to make sufficient preparations for so important an undertaking as an Irish campaign. He was moreover engaged in a war with France, and was probably more anxious to humble his old antagonist Louis XIV. than to settle the affairs of Ireland. However the matter is to be explained, William found, too late, that his neglect of Irish affairs was a great error. It encouraged the friends of James both in England and Ireland to dispute his title, and afforded time to Tyrconnel to get an army together.

He at length resolved to enter upon the task of reducing Ireland with a force adequate to the undertaking. "But he was afraid to send the late King's army to fight against him; and therefore ordered twenty-three new regiments to be raised. The levies were completed in six weeks: for England, by a long peace, was filled with men impatient for war, because they loved its glories and knew not its miseries. These regiments, with two Dutch battalions, and four of French refugees, were destined for the service; and they were to be joined in Ireland by the Inniskilliners, together with such regiments as could be spared from Scotland, because both of those bodies of men had been tried against their late master; and by six thousand hired Danes, because these knew no master except him who paid them.

Suspicion of his own subjects made William give the direction of the expedition also to foreigners. He appointed Marshal Schomberg, then eighty years of age, to be the first, and Count Solmes the second, in command. The King honoured Schomberg with a Dukedom and the Garter, and the House of Commons voted him a present of £100,000.*

There was much delay in getting the army into Ireland. Schomberg, who remained twenty days in Chester, waiting for the forces intended for Ireland to assemble there, lost patience at last, and sailed with those he had. He arrived in the Bay of Carrickfergus, on the 12th of August (O.S.), 1689, with ten thousand men, some of whom were cavalry, and with only a part of his artillery. The remainder was to follow. "He resolved by some exploit of consequence, but not of danger, to give reputation to his arms, a thing which he knew he needed, to encourage new troops, and to intimidate a new foe; and therefore about a week after his landing, he laid siege to Carrickfergus, and took it in four days, with a garrison of 2,500 men in it."† The town was delivered up on Articles highly honourable to the garrison: they were to march out "with flying colours, arms, lighted matches, and their own baggage; and be conducted by a squadron of horse to the nearest garrison of the enemy [*i.e.* a garrison belonging to the Irish army]; and that there should be no crowding or confusion as they marched out." These Articles were flagrantly violated. Story, like a true partisan, makes little or no account of the matter; all he says is, that "the Duke himself had much ado to protect them from the violence of the country people."‡ Absurd! Could not English soldiers protect them from "country people"? or, if permitted, were they not able to protect themselves, having marched out with their arms?

The true account of this transaction is to be sought for elsewhere than with Mr. George Story, the military Chaplain.

* Dalrymple, Vol. I., pp. 431-2. Schomberg was born at Schonburg Castle, on the Rhine, between Coblenz and Bingen. Like many of the great captains of his time, he was a soldier of fortune. He commenced his military career during the Thirty Years' War, in the service of Sweden. He next entered the Dutch army; after which he served France with much distinction, from 1650 to 1686, and was created a Marshal. After the revocation of the edict of Nantz, he entered the Portuguese service; then that of the Elector of Brandenburg; lastly, he joined the Prince of Orange, when preparing his expedition to England. Having, for more than half a century, escaped death in every form on nearly every battlefield of Europe, he at length met it on the banks of "the Boyne's ill-fated river;" where he was one of the first to fall, 1st July (O.S.) 1690.

† Dalrymple, Vol. I., p. 433.

‡ Story, Vol. II., pp. 7 and 8.

The journal of the most remarkable transactions in this war, published at that juncture, thus describes the breach of Articles at Carrickfergus :—"The Irish in that town, when reduced to one barrel of powder only, made soldier-like terms ; marching out with their arms, colours flying, ball in mouth, and other usual ceremonies in war ; to be attended by a convoy until they were within three miles of Newry. Yet the Articles signed by Schomberg himself, were nevertheless barbarously violated by the soldiers ; who, without regard to age, or sex, or quality, disarmed and stripped the towns-people, forcing even women to run the gauntlet stark naked."* Macpherson's account is substantially the same but fuller. "Schomberg," he says, "invested Carrickfergus ; he summoned the garrison in vain ; he opened four batteries against the place ; he attacked it with the guns of the fleet ; one thousand bombs were thrown into the town ; the houses were laid in ashes. The garrison, having expended their powder to the last barrel, marched out on the ninth day with all the honours of war. But the soldiers broke the capitulation ; they disarmed and stripped the inhabitants, without any regard to sex or quality ; even women stark naked were whipt publicly between the lines."†

From Carrickfergus Schomberg led his army to Dundalk, and pitched his camp a mile north of the town, in low marshy ground. The journey from Carrickfergus lasted six days, during which the raw English levies suffered much, because, in order to avoid the Irish cavalry they were marched chiefly through bogs, just then rendered more difficult to be traversed, as the rainy season had set in. They found the corn reaped on their route, but rotting on the ground ; the cattle had been driven away, or were here and there lying slaughtered and putrid. All the houses were deserted, over the doors or in the thatch of which crucifixes were placed, in almost every instance. No other furniture was left.‡ Schomberg entrenched himself as soon as possible at Dundalk, where the Irish army offered him battle several times, and even endeavoured to provoke or compel him to fight, but the wary old Marshal, knowing their army outnumbered his and was in better condition, refused to quit his quarters, which from their unhealthy situation soon became more like a vast hospital than a camp. After some time his chief care was to conceal the fearful mortality of his men from those who were still able for duty. It was computed that of the

* Curry's Civil Wars, Vol. II., p. 193, *note*.

† Ibid. From Macpherson's History of Great Britain, Vol. I., p. 570.

‡ Story *passim*. Dalrymple, Vol. I., pp. 435 et seq.

15,000 who at different times entered the camp, 8,000 died in it, and that the Irish losses were not much less.*

Whilst Schomberg was doing but little to advance William's cause in Ireland, William himself was teased and thwarted by the conflicting interests of the two great political parties in England. He became unpopular. He had none of the qualities which secure popularity. He scarcely appeared in public; he was difficult of approach, and was continually employed in his Cabinet with his ministers. "He thought, or pretended to think, that the smoke of London disagreed with him, and retired to Hampton Court; which provoked the citizens, who said that he retired to that place, because it was built on a dead flat, and upon the banks of water, stagnating to appearance, and hence resembled a palace in Holland."† "The populace received their impressions, as they commonly do, from their senses. They remarked the King's small stature, the weak texture of his body, and, taking an advantage of a peculiarity in his features, called him, in derision, 'hook-nose.'"‡ Warned of his growing dislike, he made what was to him a great effort. He went to the races at Newmarket, where he mingled with all sorts of people; he bore the tedium of a University reception; went to a city feast, and "was made a tradesman of London at his own request;" and the proud soldier "pretended to derive honour from being chosen master of the grocers' company."§ But it would not do. Everybody could see the awkwardness and repugnance with which he got through his part of the business on those occasions. He seemed as out of place as a fish does out of water, or the Lord Mayor's champion in armour. Then the two great political parties did fierce battle over him; each determined to make him its own. He was at his wit's end. In his perplexity he fell back upon a device, which stood him in good stead on a previous occasion; so he declared he would go back to Holland and leave the queen to govern a people, whom he found himself unable to please or to manage. "He communicated this project, with tears, to Lord Caermarthen, Lord Shrewsbury, and a few others, in hopes that from their own danger, or from tenderness to him, they might soften the mutual animosities of the parties they conducted. With tears, such as statesmen shed, they dissuaded him."|| The Tories won. He took them into his confidence; so that "in the space of little

* Ibid. Some estimated Schomberg's losses by sickness at 10,000.

† Dalrymple, Vol. I., p. 443.

‡ Ibid., p. 444.

§ Ibid., pp. 462-3.

|| Ibid., p. 462.

more than a year after William was upon the throne, he dismissed that Parliament, and broke with that party which had placed him upon it.”*

Having made his preparations for coming to Ireland, he dissolved the Parliament, left Kensington on the 4th of June, 1690, sailed from Highlake on the 12th, accompanied by 300 transports, with six ships of war to guard them, and landed on the evening of the 14th at Carrickfergus. The army which he brought over is set down roundly at 36,000 men, more than one-half of whom were foreigners, William being still afraid to trust Englishmen to fight against James, as many of them still regarded the latter as their lawful sovereign.† James fell back upon the Boyne, cautiously followed by William, who arrived at Oldbridge on Monday, the 30th of June. By the next day the battle was lost and won.

As soon as William's victory was known in London, the Queen, who kept up an active correspondence with her husband, wrote him a long letter of congratulation, which contains one very remarkable passage. Feeling that he was now master of the situation, and in a position to direct and rule in Ireland, she writes:—"I must put you in mind of one thing, believing it now the season, which is, that you would take care of the Church of Ireland. Everybody agrees that it is the worst in Christendom."‡

The day after the battle, William's forces rested on their arms at Duleek. On the 3rd news reached him that Dublin had been evacuated, and he at once sent the Duke of Ormonde to occupy it. On the 5th "our army," says Story, "marched to Finglass, a little village two miles to the north-west of Dublin, where we lay encamped for several days." Here, according to our author, William reviewed his army with much care, and found it to consist of the old number—36,000—just as before the battle; so that according to Story it was not reduced even by one at the Boyne (!) On the 6th, being Sunday, William rode to St. Patrick's Cathedral to return thanks to God for his victory. He was received by the Bishops of Meath and Limerick. Dr. King preached on the 7th. William signed a Declaration, wherein he promised "protection to all poor labourers, common soldiers, country-farmers, plow-men and cottiers; as also to all citizens, tradesmen, townsmen, and artificers, who either remained at home, or having fled from their dwellings, should return by the

* Ibid., p. 466.

† "June 27th," "Our whole army joined at Dundalk, making in all about thirty-six thousand, though the world called us at least a third more."—Story, Vol. II., p. 19.

‡ Dalrymple, Vol. III., p. 153.

first of August following," &c., leaving all others to the event of war, unless by great and manifest demonstrations they would convince his Majesty that they deserved his mercy, which he promised never to refuse to those who were truly penitent.* This was substantially a repetition of Cromwell's Declaration on his arrival in Dublin. Both, doubtless, aimed at the same thing—to give confidence to those who could aid them by their work and bring in provisions. The wealthy were left without protection because, we may suppose, they were the possessors of property which later on, was to be confiscated to reward the followers, in the one case, of Oliver, and of William, in the other.

The Irish officers justly complained that this Declaration was too narrow; that it excluded them from any advantage under it; and that they were obliged afterwards to stick together, such being their only safety. Later some alterations were made in the Declaration, but they proved equally unsatisfactory.

On the 9th, William moved southwards, and encamped at the village of Crumlin, two miles south-west of Dublin, having evidently divided the city. We next find him at Castledermot, a town in the extreme south of the Co. Kildare, near Carlow, whence he sent Brigadier Eppinger to secure Wexford. On his arrival, he found it deserted by the garrison. On the 19th William dined at Kilkenny Castle, which had been spared by Count Lauzun with all its goods and furniture. He moved forward with but little delay. Carrick, Waterford, and the almost impregnable fort of Duncannon, were summoned and surrendered to the conqueror without a blow.†

On the 8th of August he was joined by Douglas, who had been

* Story, Vol. II., p. 27.

† Whilst William was pursuing his conquests in Ireland, the news of the naval battle off Beachy Head reached him, in which the combined English and Dutch fleets suffered a severe defeat from the French. The people in England were greatly alarmed by the event, and the ministers sent pressing letters to the King to return. He shared their alarm; resolved to hasten back, and retraced his steps as far as Chapelizod, a suburb only a short distance west of Dublin, with that intention. Here a second despatch reached him, announcing that the loss at sea was not so great as at first reported, so he returned to the army then encamped near Cashel. The truth is, that the loss of the allied fleet was very great, but the French Admiral not having followed up his victory (for which he was censured by Louis XIV.), no immediate danger was apprehended.

William remained three days at Chapelizod, where he was chiefly occupied in hearing complaints against some of his officers, especially against Lieut.-General Douglas, and Colonel Trelawney's regiment, then in Dublin. He also heard petitions regarding the violation of Protections. While here he published a proclamation, dated July 31st, "commanding all the Papists to deliver up their arms, and those who did not were to be looked on as rebels and traitors, and abandoned to the discretion of the soldiers."—*Story, Vol. I., p. 111.*

repulsed at Athlone, and on the 9th, William, thus reinforced, appeared before Limerick on the Clare side. He summoned the city to surrender, but a reply refusing to do so was sent back to him by Monsieur Boisseleau, the Duke of Berwick, Sarsfield, and the other commanders.

On receipt of this answer, William commenced active preparations for his attack. On the evening of the day on which it was received, a strong party of dragoons was sent to examine the pass of Armaghbeg, three miles above the city, and on the next day, Sunday, August 10th, he despatched eight squadrons of horse and dragoons, commanded by Lieutenant-General Ginkle, and three regiments of foot under Major-General Kirk, in all 5,000, to that pass. The river was crossed without opposition, being at the time unusually low, though rapid and dangerous. The King himself soon appeared at the place and arranged that three regiments should encamp beyond the river, and two at the point they had arrived at. So that the pass was held at both sides. The Irish offered no opposition to these movements, but sedulously applied themselves to the strengthening of their defences. The "heavy guns, ammunition, ten boats, a great store of provisions, and abundance of other things" were on their way from Dublin under the care of two troops of [Villiers'] horse. Next morning, the 11th, a country gentleman named Manus O'Brien arrived at the English camp, and gave notice that Sarsfield had passed the river with a body of horse during the night, and must have been on some extraordinary design. Of this design O'Brien seems to have been ignorant, but it was to attack the party convoying the supplies for the siege. Story says the Irish got information about this matter from a French gunner, who had deserted to them. Sarsfield and his party crossed the Shannon at Killaloe, 12 miles above Limerick, taking with them all the best horse and dragoons that were in the town.* It was on Sunday night, the 10th of August, that he started on his perilous enterprise. He proceeded along the right bank of the river until he reached O'Brien's bridge (an old pass on the river), which he found guarded by a party of William's soldiers. He could not therefore get over that way without fighting and defeating them. Even this would have been ruinous to his design, secrecy being essential to its success.

At Ballycorney he is said to have taken for guide a young man named Cecil, who was well acquainted with the locality. Having safely and unobserved passed to the Tipperary side of the

* Story, Vol. I., p. 119. The Duke of Berwick in his *Memoirs* says they numbered 600.—See Lenihan's *Limerick*, p. 233, *note*.

Shannon, he made his way across the country between Ballina and Boher. Next morning vedettes were sent out to watch the coming of the ammunition train, then on its way from Cashel, and supposed to be no great distance off. In due time it was sighted, and information was obtained that it was to encamp for the night near the hill of Ballyneety, a remarkable conical elevation which can be seen from a great distance. Next night Sarsfield moved towards the hill, and halted at some distance from it. About midnight he crept cautiously upon the sleeping convoy. When the first sentinel challenged and demanded the pass-word, it was given—"Sarsfield." Proceeding further into the encampment, on a second sentinel demanding the word, the response was given apparently by Sarsfield himself,—"**SARSFIELD IS THE WORD, AND SARSFIELD IS THE MAN.**"* The sentinel was immediately shot down, the firing of a shot being the signal agreed upon for the whole body of the Irish to advance. They did so, and at once fell upon the half-awakened and astonished Williamites, making short work of them. When the slaughter was done, Sarsfield had their cannon loaded to their muzzles, sunk into the ground and discharged, which gave such a tremendous report, that it was distinctly heard in the English camp, which was 14 or 15 miles distant.† "The Irish took no prisoners; only a lieutenant of Colonel Earl's, being sick in a house hard-by, was stript and brought to Sarsfield, who used him very civilly, telling him if he had not succeeded in that enterprise, he had then gone for France."‡ Sarsfield returned to his quarters without the loss of a single man!§

In spite of the disaster at Ballyneety, William proceeded with

* Mr. Lenihan gives it, "Sarsfield is the *pass*-word," &c. This famous reply was known far and wide through Ireland down to our own times, and no doubt lives still in tradition, but I never heard the word "*pass*" introduced into it before, and it certainly injures the antithesis. The discovery of the watchword is thus accounted for by Mr. Lenihan :—"One of Sarsfield's troopers, whose horse got lame, fell into the rere of his party : he met the wife of one of William's soldiers who had remained behind the Williamites on their march, and taking compassion on her, he enabled her to proceed on her journey. By this means the trooper obtained the watchword of the English."—History of Limerick, p. 232. How strange that the watchword should be "Sarsfield!"

† Story says seven miles, but this is a mistake, as Ballyneety, according to Mr. Lenihan, is *about* 14 miles from Limerick, and William's camp was only "a little mile from the town."—History of King William III., Vol. 2, p. 209.

‡ Ibid.

§ Captain Parke's Memoirs, p. 23. Sarsfield was accompanied on this service by a famous Rapparee, known as "Galloping Hogan," "who knew every pass and defile—was familiar with every track and roadway—with every ford and bog—and in a critical juncture like the present, was the best man that could be obtained to give effectual assistance to the grand exploit."—Lenihan, p. 231.

the siege, resolving to make a supreme effort. The preparatory works for storming the place were pushed forward with increased energy. On the 17th, five days after he had lost his guns and ammunition train, some pieces of heavy ordnance arrived to him from Waterford, and the trenches were opened. New guns were planted at certain points, a fort was taken from the besieged, who, on their side, made a sally which inflicted much damage on the besiegers. Additional batteries were raised, and shells and red-hot balls were incessantly poured into the city. At length on the 27th, a practicable breach, twelve yards wide, was made near St. John's gate, and at half-past three the same day, the city was stormed by 10,000 picked soldiers.* The fighting at the breach was of the fiercest kind. After sometime, says Story, the Irish gave way, and began to throw down their arms and run into the city. The English, he continues, who pursued them were not supported and got fearfully cut up within: "some were shot, some taken, and the rest came out again, but very few without being wounded."† This repulse of the besiegers gave new courage to the Irish, so they returned to the breach, and poured bullets, stones, bottles, and every kind of missile they could find, upon the besiegers, with deadly effect. The Brandenburg regiment composed of William's own countrymen, was almost annihilated in an attempt to take the Black Battery. "When the work was at the hottest," writes Story, "the Brandenburg regiment (who behaved themselves very well) were got upon the Black Battery, where the enemies' powder happened to take fire, and blew up a great many of them, the men, faggots, stones, and what not, flying into the air with a most terrible noise."‡ But Lenihan denies it was an accident, and asserts that they were blown up by a mine at the battery, which was fired while the Brandenburgers were crowding thickest about it.§ "After about three hours it was judged safest to return to their trenches." The English historians say their ammunition was spent, and make various other excuses for the defeat of William's attack. But the best answer to all this is, that he did not attempt another; so far from it, he at once began preparations to get away with his broken legions. On the 30th of August, the heavy baggage and cannon were sent off, and the next day the army decamped, and marched towards Clonmel. "The King having, on the 4th of September, constituted the Lord Sydney, Sir Charles Porter, and

* Lenihan, p. 247.

† Story, Part I., p. 129.

‡ Impartial History, &c., Part I., p. 129.

§ History of Limerick, p. 245.

Thomas Coningsby, Lords Justices of Ireland, and committed the care of the army to Count Solmes, who soon afterwards resigned it to Lieut.-General Ginkle, embarked at Duncannon, with Prince George of Denmark, and other persons of distinction; he arrived the next day in King's-road near Bristol, and on the 9th at Windsor, where he was received by the Queen with that joy, which none but his own could equal."* So that after his defeat at Limerick, William hurried out of Ireland with the expedition of one who was glad to get away.†

Immediately after their defeat at Limerick the English forces went into winter quarters, chiefly in the South; Douglas however went northwards for his quarters. Cork was in the hands of the Irish. It was strengthened by them, aided by the French, but the works were very extensive, and required a large force to defend them, whereas the garrison consisted of only 4,000 men; besides "there was a station, which, if occupied, would make the works of little avail." Marlborough knew this station and had other valuable information about the defences of the city. Moreover, having heard that the French fleet was laid up for the season, he pressed the Queen and Council to trust him with 5,000 of the

* Harris's Life of William III., Vol. 3, p. 115.

† The following ghastly account is given of an occurrence said to have happened at the close of the siege:—"De Burgho relates that William, in his haste to decamp, left a vast number of men sick and disabled in hospital. He was asked by such of the generals as dared to approach him, what was to be done with the sick and wounded. De Burgho gives the reply—with fury in his eyes, and rage consuming him, roaring out, he said, '*Let them be burned*'—'let them be set fire to;' and forthwith the hospital was enveloped in flames."—Lenihan's History of Limerick, p. 249.

It is only just to the character of William to give the full passage from De Burgho. The following is a translation of it:—

"The Prince of Orange, elated with victory after having taken many strongholds, namely, Dublin, Kilkenny, Wexford, Clonmel, and Waterford, besieged, in person, the strongly fortified city of Limerick, but failed in his attempt to take it. Having remained nearly a month before it, and when a great number of his soldiers had been slain, he was compelled to raise the siege and retire. The haughty prince was so fired with anger, that when, on leaving the place, he was asked what was to be done with the soldiers who were wounded and sick, he answered in a fury, '*Burn them*,'—a thing, we may fairly believe, he by no means intended; yet the officers, fearing his indignation, took care to follow his command to the very letter, although it far surpassed all Scythian cruelty. Hence (horrible to relate) a thousand men at least, perfectly innocent, were delivered to be burned alive."—*Hibernia Dominicana*, p. 144.

Obs.—Opposite accounts are given with regard to a second attempt to take Limerick, e.g., "Next day the soldiers were in hopes that his Majesty would give orders for a second attack, and seemed resolved to have the town or lose all their lives."—Story, Part II., p. 39.

"Theodore (William) resolving to renew the assault next day, could not persuade his men to advance, though he offered to lead them in person. Whereupon, all in a rage, he left the camp."—*Macariae Excidium*, p. 50. Published by the Camden Society.

troops who were then lying idle in England, and pawned his reputation, that he would take both Cork and Kinsale before winter. They yielded to that confidence of success which in great geniuses is irresistible; and he arrived at Cork upon the 21st of September. The Duke of Wirtemberg with an army of 4,000, encamped at the north side of the city, so that Cork found itself invested by 9,000 men and the fleet. It held out for a few days, and then surrendered to superior forces. As soon as it was taken, the sailors and "many loose persons" entered through the breach, and plundered many houses, "especially of Papists." "In the afternoon all Papists were ordered by proclamation on pain of death to deliver up their arms." The day after the taking of Cork, Marlborough sent Brigadier Villiers to summon Kinsale. This was the 29th (O.S.) September. Marlborough followed with his army, and on the 5th of October, the governor beat a parley; the garrison, 1,200 or 1,500 in number, marched out with bag and baggage, and they were conducted to Limerick by a party of English horse.* "Marlborough returned to London upon the 28th of October, vain, that, like a soldier, he had kept his word; but secretly indignant, that it was not oftener put to the test. The nation received him with acclamations, observing with a mixture of honest pride and malignant jealousy, that an English officer had done more in a month, than all the King's foreign generals had done in two campaigns."†

* Story, Part II., p. 44. Dalrymple, Vol. I., p. 504.

† Dalrymple, Vol. I., p. 505.

CHAPTER XXIV.

WHEN the time arrived for opening the campaign of 1691, the English turned their attention to Athlone, being a place of strength and importance, then held by the Irish. On the 19th of June, the army under Ginkle, numbering about 18,000 men, appeared before that town, and on the 20th their batteries began to play on a bastion not far from what was known as the Dublin gate. On the same day the English town which had but poor defences, was taken by storm; after this, operations were immediately commenced against the Irish town, which was much better fortified than the former.

The besiegers at once began to concentrate all their skill and efforts at the bridge which spanned the Shannon, and was the only passage into the Irish town. At its port on the 21st, a battery was erected for five twenty-four pounders, and a floor made for six mortars. On the 24th two more batteries were planted near the bridge, one above and one below it. The Irish on their side, proceeded with such defences as they hoped would make it impossible for the besiegers to pass over, so that for the moment, the bridge was literally the bone of contention between the contending forces. The expenditure of ammunition on the English side was immense, but thirty waggons laden with powder having arrived at the camp, they were inspired with renewed energy, and opened fire from seven batteries, on the works of the Irish, which they, on their side, persevered in repairing with much loss of life, but with unflagging courage. Meantime a lieutenant of horse with a party was sent to Lanesborough, where a ford, as the general was informed, would be found, that could be passed safely and unawares. The lieutenant had orders to return without delay as soon as he had found the ford. This he failed to do, for seeing a prey of cattle at some distance he could not resist the temptation of securing them, and in attempting to do so he was observed by some of the Irish, who, perceiving that he had found the ford, reported the same. Strong works were quickly constructed to defend it; so the design came to nothing. The lieutenant paid dearly for his cupidity, for

he was tried and suffered for it.* The hope of passing the ford towards Lanesborough having been frustrated, the commanders made up their mind that there was nothing for it, but to force their way across the bridge in spite of the losses it was sure to entail. All the batteries played on the works of the Irish incessantly through the night of the 26th, which enabled the English to possess themselves of the bridge, except one broken arch at the Irish or Connaught side. On the night of the 26th the English "wrought very hard on the last arch in the enemies' possession." "But," adds Story, "what we got here was inch by inch as it were, the enemy sticking very close to it, though great numbers of them were slain by our guns; and this service cost us great store of ammunition."†

On the evening of the 27th the English with their grenades burned the breastworks the Irish had erected at their side of the broken arch, and continued to work incessantly through the night, in order to get possession of it. On the morning of the 28th, they laid their beams across it, and succeeded in placing some planks on the beams, which the Irish perceiving, detached a sergeant and ten men out of Maxwell's regiment, clad in armour, who crossed their own works to destroy those of the English: they were all killed. "And yet this did not discourage as many more from setting about the same piece of service, and they effected it by throwing down our planks and beams, maugre all our firing and skill, though they all lost their lives as testimonies of their valour, except two, who escaped amongst all the fire and smoke."‡ The famous broken arch still yawned between the belligerents, and barred the English from crossing. Thus repeatedly driven back they held a council of war which resulted in a determination to attempt the passage in three different places: (1) by the bridge, on which they had begun the construction of a close gallery; (2) by floats and pontoons; (3) by the ford below the bridge, where the horse were also to pass and second the foot. The attack was to be conducted by Major-General Mackey. This plan, so formidable in appearance, was not even attempted, because the Irish by throwing their hand grenades

* "Such are the powerful charms of black cattle to some sorts of people, that the lieutenant espying a prey some distance from him, *on the other side*, must needs be scampering after them; by which means our design was discovered." —Story, Part II., p. 100.

† Story, Part II., p. 102.

‡ Ibid. General Mackey's MS. Memoirs, quoted by Dalrymple. This name is spelled as above by Story, but McKay, by Dalrymple. The latter is perhaps the more correct, as Dalrymple, like the general, was a Scotchman; yet it is signed Maccay to the Articles of Limerick, in the copy of those Articles printed "by Authority" in 1692.

across the broken arch set the close gallery on fire, and burned a great part of it. The English were at their wit's end. Another council of war was called, and the question was discussed whether or not they could remain any longer before Athlone, seeing that forage for miles round was exhausted. They resolved to make one trial more, and it succeeded. At this juncture two officers having deserted from the Irish, swam the river, and assured the English commander, that now was his time to make another attempt, for the Irish felt so secure of their last success, they would be taken unawares. The ford mentioned above, having been examined some days previously by three Danes, was pronounced passible. To reach the Connaught side of the river was by its means now their sole remaining hope ; so they nerved themselves for the perilous attempt.* Two thousand picked men were told off for the service. Sixty were clad in armour, who under command of Captain Sandys took the river, twenty abreast; the English meantime firing furiously on the works of the Irish, to distract their attention from the enterprise. The 60 armed men gained the Connaught bank, and were soon followed by others; the boats and pontoons were got into requisition, the broken arch was planked over, the men poured into the Irish town by the three ways, and had possession of it in half an hour. The Irish, as the deserters had foretold, were taken by surprise. All their best troops had been sent to the camp to take some rest after their great fatigues; and "three of the most indifferent regiments in the Irish army were only then upon guard;"† in fact so poor an opinion had the general of them, that they had not been previously entrusted with the defence of the town at all, but after the severe repulse the English had suffered, he felt assured that no danger was to be feared, until the veterans, who had defended the town so bravely, would be rested. The Irish sent a hurried message to St. Ruth to come to their assistance. He is said to have ridiculed the idea of the English making an attempt to cross the river, and he so near with a good army; he learned his mistake too late. An effort was made to retake the town, but without success.‡

The Irish, on losing Athlone, fell back westwards and took up a strong position at Aughrim. The English followed, and in the face of great difficulties won the decisive battle which has

* "For the greater encouragement of the soldiers the General distributed a sum of guineas amongst them, knowing the powerful influence of gold." These are Story's words. I suppose they mean that each soldier got a guinea.

† Story, Part II., p. 106.

‡ General Mackey's MS. Memoirs.

been named from that place. The death of St. Ruth, which occurred about sunset, so discouraged his troops, that it may be said to have terminated the battle, "which up to that," Story says, "was fought with much courage," and was in favour of the Irish. Sarsfield was second in command, but when St. Ruth fell, he was puzzled what to do, because as he and St. Ruth were not on friendly terms, the plan of battle was not communicated to him. This, and the confusion caused by the personal guard of St. Ruth rushing back with his dead body, which to many of the troops seemed to be a retreat, changed the fortune of the day. The English became the victors; they pursued the vanquished four miles, "but," says Dalrymple, "disgraced all the glories of the day by giving no quarter."*

St. Ruth was a brave soldier and a good general. He has been much blamed for the way in which he managed his Irish campaign, but like nearly every one who has not succeeded, he has been too much blamed. The censures cast upon him are chiefly from English sources, and must, therefore, be accepted with great modification, for, after the Irish, the French come in for the greatest amount of English hatred. His chief fault was his want of the *entente cordiale* towards Sarsfield. Whether it was pride, jealousy, or overweening conceit, this was inexcusable. Sarsfield was next to himself in command, and was therefore entitled to be confided in and consulted; but when we consider the soldier Sarsfield was, his knowledge of the country and its people, not to have consulted him, not to have trusted him, not to have utilized his great qualities, was an unpardonable blunder, and was naturally followed by ruinous defeat. His not having hastened to the succour of Athlone, on receipt of the urgent message from the garrison, which he knew to be a weak one, was another blunder, but it is more capable of being excused than the former. It happened chiefly through want of that knowledge which Sarsfield could have given him, and which, in an angry mood, he did give him, namely, the dogged perseverance of which English soldiers were capable. When St. Ruth came to Ireland, he found the force he had been sent to lead too small for aggressive warfare; it was, besides, an undisciplined force, ill clad, ill fed, ill paid. So he prudently stood on the defensive, but mortified at the loss of Athlone, he changed his mind, and resolved to stake the result of the campaign on a single battle,

* Memoirs, Vol. I., p. 559. Authorities differ as to the relative numbers of the opposing armies, but it is probable the Irish force was the lesser, besides that they were ill provided, especially with artillery, while the English had everything in abundance.

which he did at Aughrim. No one has ever ventured to question his generalship in his choice of Aughrim for his battle ground, nor the disposition of his forces there; but the world regards it as a great fault to lose: St. Ruth lost, and as a matter of course he is loaded with censure. The man who wins is scarcely ever blamed; everything is forgotten in the blaze of victory, which disarms and paralyses the critic, so that if he points out faults he has no sympathisers; one word—"Victory"—is an all-sufficient reply to him. It is no rash conjecture, that, had St. Ruth lived, he would, in all probability, have won the battle. Had this been so, he might have marched triumphantly to the gates of Dublin, for "it was known that De Ginkle had not made proper securities behind him for retreat."* Had St. Ruth won, and marched upon Dublin, words could not be found strong enough by the English to denounce De Ginkle's incapacity, and instead of himself and his descendants being the richly endowed pensioners of England for two centuries, the grave of his reputation would have been dug near the place whence he derived his pension and his title.†

The battle of Aughrim was fought on the 12th July (O.S.), and one week afterwards the English army appeared before Galway, which contained a garrison of something over 2,000 men, whose main reliance was on the promised aid of Balldearg O'Donnell, a chief about whom prophecies were rife, foretelling that he was the man destined to free Ireland. He had, for a time, a large number of followers, but they rapidly melted away from him, and he was glad to make terms with De Ginkle. The garrison, seeing no hope from O'Donnell, opened negotiations with that general, the day after he had appeared before the city. They obtained very good terms, because he had orders to end the war as soon as possible, but, of course, they were violated as coolly as the Treaty of Limerick.

While detached parties of English soldiers and militia were scouring the country, and hanging and shooting rapparees, or such of the people as they chose to call rapparees, De Ginkle, with a force of 1,500 horse and dragoons, and a reserve of 1,000 foot, proceeded with his principal officers to inspect the defences of Limerick, whilst the main body of his army were encamped at Caringlass. Reinforcements under Sir John Hannings and

* General Mackey's M.S. Memoirs, quoted by Dalrymple, Vol. I., p. 532. Dublin was in such an alarm that the inhabitants hurried to build defences round the city.

† There is a full and admirable account of the battle of Aughrim to be found in Haverty's History of Ireland, in which the character of St. Ruth is dealt with in a just and unprejudiced manner.

others soon arrived and joined him, so that his army when it came before Limerick, on the 25th of August, 1691, was stronger than at the opening of the campaign. It took up nearly the same position before the city, which the English had occupied the previous year. The siege having lasted one month, the garrison beat a parley and a cessation was agreed to. The Irish sent out proposals under seven heads, which were rejected by the besiegers; new Articles were drawn up, and after considerable discussion between the chief men of both armies, the famous Treaty of Limerick was agreed to; it bears the date of the 3rd of October, 1691.

This Treaty, so full of historic interest—so shamefully violated—demands something more than a passing notice.

It contains forty-two Articles in all, twenty-nine military and thirteen civil: it is with the civil Articles only that we are here concerned. The first of them runs thus: "The Roman Catholics of this Kingdom shall enjoy such privileges in the exercise of their religion, as are consistent with the laws of Ireland; or, as they did enjoy in the reign of King Charles the II.; and their Majesties as soon as their affairs will permit them to summon a Parliament in this Kingdom, will endeavour to procure the said Roman Catholics such further security in that particular, as may preserve them from any disturbance upon account of their said religion." This Article "intended obviously," says Mr. Froude, "to confer religious liberty, might mean much or little, as it was interpreted;" and he proceeds to suggest that it could be interpreted to mean but "little." "The Act of the 2nd of Elizabeth against Catholic worship was still unrepealed, although seldom enforced; under Charles II. the practice varied," and so Mr. Froude, with his usual adroitness, supplies, as he evidently desires, a defence for the violation of the said Article. He further says that the word "endeavour," contained therein, might be "only a form of courtesy," and might "leave an opening to Parliament to refuse its sanction." Mr. Froude ought to know, and probably even felt at the time he wrote the above, that a solemn treaty for the delivering up of such a stronghold as Limerick was no time for such deceptive courtesies, and William's after conduct with regard to the treaty shows he was honestly inclined to carry it out to the full extent, if permitted. Mr. Froude, who is elsewhere very severe on William for his concessions 'to the Irish,' surely contradicts himself here, when he says "endeavour" might be intended by William as a courtesy instead of a reality.*

* The English in Ireland, Vol. I., pp. 203-4. See also note.

But the restoration of the omitted clause in the second Article of the Treaty by the King himself is the best and completest answer to Mr. Froude. Having given his full approval to the Treaty as printed, William goes on to say: "And whereas it appears unto us, that it was agreed between the parties to the said Articles, that after the words: Limerick, Clare, Kerry, Cork, Mayo, or any of them in the second of the said Articles, the words following, viz.: '*And all such as are under their protection in the said Counties,*' should be inserted, and be part of the said Articles. Which words having been casually omitted by the writer, the omission was not discovered till after the said Articles were signed, but was taken notice of before the second town was surrendered; and that our said Justices and General, or one of them, did promise that the said clause should be made good, it being within the intention of the capitulation, and inserted in the full draught thereof. *Our further will and pleasure is*, and we do hereby ratifie and confirm the said omitted words, viz.: *and all such as are under their protection in the said Counties.* Hereby for us, our heirs and successors, ordaining and declaring, that all and every person and persons therein concerned, shall and may have, receive and enjoy the benefit thereof, in such and the same manner, as if the said words had been inserted in their proper place, in the said second Article; any omission, defect or mistake in the said second Article, in any wise notwithstanding." The King's ratification of the Articles of Limerick, from which the above extract is taken, was published by authority in 1692, with the Royal Arms on the title page in the usual manner. The ratification itself, including the above passage, is printed at the end of the Articles; yet Mr. Froude, with a courage all his own, writes of the restoration of the omitted words as follows:—"The deliberate assertion of William ought not to be lightly questioned, yet it is difficult to credit that the accidental omission of a paragraph of such enormous consequence should have passed undetected. The more probable explanation is, that the Lords Justices, who had arrived at the camp when the treaty was in progress, narrowed down the King's liberality and extorted harder terms than he had prescribed or desired."* This supposes that the Irish had agreed to the "narrowing down," which is quite untrue; for in the words of the King himself, the clause had been casually omitted by the writer, but the omission had been discovered before the second

* The English in Ireland, Vol. I., p. 206.

town was surrendered. Mr. Froude, of course, will not accept what seems to me the truest explanation of this remarkable incident, namely, that inasmuch as the clause in question saved the properties of thousands of Irish Catholics from the clutches of greedy English Adventurers, it was, by a touch of legerdemain, omitted on set purpose; and that the Irish had discovered the fraud before the second or English town was delivered up.* Mr. Froude goes on: "Once more, in conclusion, the conditional character attached to the first of the Articles was extended to the whole."

The reader will please refer to the first Article, just cited in full, where he will see that the first clause is an *unconditional* concession; and that it is to the second only, in which their Majesties promised to "endeavour to secure the said Roman Catholics such *further* security," &c., that a condition is attached.

William bound himself by the Second Article to summon a Parliament, as soon as the state of his affairs would permit, to ratify the Treaty. The first Parliament that was summoned after it, met on the 5th of October, 1692, but was dissolved in September, 1693, without having had the Articles of Limerick brought before it. This in itself was a violation of the promise given in the Second Article; for the clear meaning of that Article is that the Treaty would be ratified, or at least brought before the first Parliament that could be called; so that the summoning of such Parliament was principally for the purpose of ratifying the Articles. Hence its dissolution, without anything having been done in that matter, was a violation of the Second Article. But why observe treaties, however solemn, with a crushed and hated race? Their army had gone to France, they were prostrated in the dust. They had no power to insist on the observance of treaties, hardly courage enough to complain of their violation. Surely the time had come to proceed with and finish that **EXTERMINATION** of the natives, which was so long the favourite project of the English. Hence in this Parliament there was an Act passed "for the encouragement of Protestant strangers to settle in Ireland," provided that they took the oath of Allegiance and subscribed the

* This is also the opinion of Mr. Prendergast, who says of Mr. Froude's explanation: "This is not the true state of facts. The treaty was concluded. The formal instrument ought to have followed the draft. But a most material part of the agreement was designedly and fraudulently omitted, and the Irish party signed in inadvertence."—Froude Reviewed, part II. *The Nation* (newspaper) 7 Dec., 1872.

Declaration, "that the transubstantiation of the elements into the body and blood of Christ, and the adoration (*sic*) of saints are superstitious and idolatrous." If they did this they were allowed to have public worship, and perform other religious duties according to their own several rites as used in their own countries. So there was Irish land and toleration for anybody but an Irish papist.* This law met with no opposition; but because the Commons rejected a money bill which did not originate with them, as it should have done, Sydney "checked them in a severe speech, and entered a protest against their proceedings in his Majesty's name."† Two years had passed before another Parliament was assembled. Meantime, the Government officials, the sheriffs, and, in fact, all those in authority throughout the country, behaved as if no Articles of Limerick had been agreed to at all. A numerous and powerful faction maintained that the Irish should have got no terms, and that it was a crime in the General and the Lords-Justices to have agreed to them. As the Irish were not in a condition to defend themselves, this tyrannical faction, in their insolent strength, trampled upon the helpless people, and acted as they pleased. "The designing men of this party," says Harris, "quarrelled with the Articles, only because their expectations were disappointed, of raising large fortunes out of the forfeitures by their interest or their money."‡ This war against the Articles of Limerick was proclaimed, even from the pulpit, as soon as they

* The favourite object of the Irish Governor and the English Parliament was the utter extermination of all the Catholic inhabitants of Ireland. Their estates were already marked out, and allotted to their conquerors; so that they and their posterity were consigned to inevitable ruin." Leland III., 192.

It was confidently averred that Sir John Clotworthy, who well knew the designs of the faction that governed in the House of Commons of England, had declared there in a speech, "that the conversion of the Papists in Ireland was only to be effected by the Bible in one hand and the sword in the other." *Nelson*. Quoted by Carte, Vol. I., p. 235. "And Mr. Pym gave out that they would not leave a priest in Ireland." *Ib.* p. 236. "To the like effect Sir William Parsons, out of a strange weakness, or detestable policy, positively asserted before many witnesses, at a public entertainment in Dublin, 'that within a twelvemonth no Catholic should be seen in Ireland.'" *Ib.* p. 236.

"It is evident, however, from their last letter [that of the ministers of the Crown] to the Lord Lieutenant, just mentioned, that they hoped for an *extirpation*, not of the mere Irish only, but of all the old English families also that were Roman Catholics." History of the Rebellion and Civil War in Ireland, by [the Rev.] Ferd. Warner, LL.D., p. 176. *2nd Ed.*

But the Irish Papists still survive; they seem to spring spontaneously from the soil, like that immortal plant which clothes our plains with verdure, and they are as difficult to be eradicated.

† Harris's William III., Vol. 3, p. 251.

‡ Life of William III., Vol. 3, p. 247.

were signed. The very next Sunday after the Lords-Justices had returned from the camp at Limerick, Dr. Dopping, Bishop of Meath, preached before them in Christ's Church, Dublin, telling them to their faces "that the peace ought not to be observed with a people so perfidious; that they kept neither articles nor oaths longer than was for their interest, and that, therefore, these articles, which were intended for a security, would prove a snare, and would only enable the rebels to play their pranks over again on the first opportunity."*

The second Parliament which was held after the Treaty of Limerick was opened by Lord Capel, who had been appointed Lord Deputy the previous May.† The session opened on the 19th of August, 1695, 7 William III. In his address on the occasion, Capel, who was of course but the mouthpiece of the King, made no reference to the Articles of Limerick, but urgently recommended the making of such laws as would prevent their "enemies" (meaning the Catholics) from ever again being able to give them any trouble. After announcing that the King was in need of money to pay his debts and support the army he becomes pious, and tells them to turn their attention to the building of churches as a "tribute due to Almighty God for their late preservation and delivery;" and assures them it will be one of the best means they can think of to preserve the true established religion and to provide against future rebellions.‡ He next informs them that the Lords-Justices of England had re-transmitted all the bills sent to them, and that some of those bills would more effectually provide for their future security "than hath ever hitherto been done;" he expresses his opinion that the want of such laws had been "the great cause of their past miseries," and he urges them to lay hold on the opportunity afforded of "making such a lasting settlement that it may never more be in the power of their enemies to bring the like calamities upon them, or to put England to such a vast expense of blood and treasure."§ The laws enacted in this Parliament are the best commentary on the above words of Lord Deputy Capel.||

* Ibid. p. 248.

† Sydney was recalled in 1693, and Capel, Sir Cyril Wyche, and Mr. Duncombe were appointed Lords-Justices. The two latter were too honest and impartial for Capel, so he got rid of them, and obtained the office of Lord Deputy for himself.

‡ Commons' Journals (Irish), Vol. II., p. 44.

§ Ibid.

|| There were no Catholics in this Parliament. They were excluded from both Houses by an English Statute passed in 1691. 3 William and Mary, Chap. 2. (England). They were not excluded as Catholics; but it was enacted

By the first of these laws Catholics were forbidden, under severe penalties, to establish schools for the education of their children. The note in the margin of the Act is, "Mischief of tolerating popish schools at home." It is further provided that persons of the popish religion shall not publicly teach school, nor shall they be allowed to do so in private houses, except the children or others under the guardianship of the master or mistress of such private house or family. Whoever did so would incur the penalty of three months' imprisonment and a fine of £20. The Acts of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth for establishing public [Protestant] schools were revived, and ordered to be put in execution. While education was thus banned at home, it was made criminal to seek it abroad; and Catholic parents were prohibited from sending their children to foreign schools of any kind, or even to have them trained up "in any private popish family." Should parents succeed in evading this law, and send their children to be educated abroad by stealth, and supply them with the means of support there, the penalties for doing so were terrible, and they applied to whomsoever sent such support as well as to parents. Persons found guilty of those offences were deprived of the power of ever prosecuting a lawsuit in any court, no matter how good their cause, or how great the loss they suffered by such deprivation; neither could they be guardians, executors, or administrators; they became incapable of receiving any legacy of deed or gift, and could not hold any office during their natural lives. This is falsely styled a clause "to restrain foreign education," as if Protestants, equally with Catholics, were restrained by it. But, oh, boasted British Constitution, where are your blushes? The offences in these cases were taken as committed, unless the party accused proved the contrary! The accuser had no trouble at all. He had only to put the accused on his trial, rack him with questions, which he had to answer on his oath, and find him guilty if he did not prove a negative. By chapter 5 of this Act, Catholics were

that neither peer nor commoner could sit in Parliament without taking the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, making and subscribing the declaration against Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Idolatry of the Church of Rome, the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin, the Saints, etc. It was illegal and an invasion of the rights of the Irish Parliament to apply this Act to Ireland. The English Parliament had no authority to make laws for Ireland; all the authority they had regarding this country was founded on Poyning's law, which was, that the Irish Parliament could not pass any bill without first submitting its heads to the English Privy Council for approval. If approved of, it was sent back, if not, no more was heard about it. Those rejected bills were not destroyed; they exist somewhere still. They would be curious and instructive reading now.

deprived of the power of bearing arms, all licences to bear arms were revoked, and the Catholics had to deliver up all guns, etc., and ammunition in their possession. The penalty for the first offence against this law was fine and imprisonment, and for the second præmunire. Magistrates were empowered to search houses for arms—an authority which opened the way to all kinds of insult and outrage. Catholics were not allowed to have a horse above £5 in value, it being assumed, says Mr. Froude, that they only required them “for agricultural purposes.” No; not that. But their slavery would be incomplete if they possessed horses good enough “to ride or drive.” Any Protestant could tender five guineas for the horse of a Catholic, and if the owner refused it, it might be lodged with a magistrate and the horse seized.* Such was the fear lest the Irish might have it in their power to obtain arms in any way, that gunmakers and sword cutlers were forbidden to receive Catholic apprentices; nor could they themselves practise their trades without having taken the Oath of Allegiance, and the usual oaths against popery. There was a fine of £20 for every offence against this law, and the indenture was made void. Magistrates were authorised to send for apprentices to those trades, and tender the oaths to them, a refusal to take which was regarded as a conviction. There is a note appended to this law in the Statute Book, that it is “intended to be a perpetual law.” Chapter 21 of this Statute was, as it is there declared, “for the suppression of tories, rapparees, etc., as their existence greatly discouraged the re-planting of the Kingdom”—not with trees be it known to the reader, but “with [Protestant] strangers.” From the wording of this chapter we may fairly conclude that any native who manifested opposition to a Protestant stranger, who came to settle down on the land so lately his, was to be regarded as a tory or a rapparee, and treated accordingly. The baronies were made responsible for any depredations of the rapparees, and the Catholic inhabitants were compelled to make good any loss or injury inflicted within

* The following story was current in Meath many years ago. A Protestant met a Catholic neighbour on the high way riding a horse of far more value than five pounds. He took the requisite sum out of his pocket, and tendering it to the owner, claimed the horse. The owner said, “Oh, I see, Mr. —, you mean to put the old penal statute in force against me. Very well.” And so he dismounted. The Protestant took his place and rode off. The owner prosecuted him for *robbing* him of a bridle and saddle. Robbery was at the time a capital offence, and the story ran that the Protestant was capitally convicted in Trim at the following assizes, a fact that put an end to such scandalous proceedings, of which the Protestants themselves had become ashamed.

their several baronies. Persons represented by the grand juries as "on their keeping" (as the phrase was), were to be proclaimed, and unless they surrendered to take their trials, they were outlawed. To conceal or harbour them was made felony, and any one who would bring in a proclaimed tory, dead or alive, was entitled to a reward of twenty pounds.*

Such was the legislation the Irish received instead of the ratification of the Articles of Limerick.

Having done such an amount of effective persecuting work, and having given it two years to take effect, the Parliament bethought them of doing something about the Articles of Limerick. What mockery! but it is just possible, that those tyrants, wise in their own conceits, meant it to be accepted that the placing of those penal laws on the statute before any ratification was given to the Articles of Limerick justified them in dealing with those Articles just as they pleased. The charm persecution had for them was wonderful. Even in the Session of 9 William III. which seems to have been specially called to deal with those Articles, the first thing the Parliament did, was to hurl one more thunderbolt at the devoted head of Popery. By Chapter I. it is enacted, "That all Papists exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and all regulars, should quit the kingdom before the first of May, 1698." Those who remained after that were punished with fines and forfeitures; and any person who harboured them was to be dealt with in the same manner. Magistrates failing to put this law in execution, were fined £100 for each offence, and "disabled" from serving as Justices during their lives. For any of the so expelled ecclesiastics to return was high treason. One of the reasons given in the preamble for this enactment is that the presence of those ecclesiastics in Ireland tended to the "great impoverishing of many of his Majesty's subjects, who are forced to maintain and support them." What bowels of compassion those men had for the poor Papists against whom the above Draconic laws had been but just enacted!

Having thus offered incense to the Moloch of religious persecution, they proceed to eliminate from the Treaty of Limerick all the provisions of real value; and this proceeding they have the hardihood to designate a confirmation of that Treaty. Addressing the King, they state in the Preamble, that,† "Whereas, your Majesty hath been graciously pleased to recommend to your Parliament, that the said Articles, *or such of them as may consist with the safety and welfare of your Majesty's subjects of*

* 7 William and Mary, Cap. 21. Irish Statutes, Vol. II.

† C. II. 9 William III.

*this kingdom,** may be confirmed by authority of this present Parliament; we the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, &c., and the Commons in this present Parliament assembled," &c. In this so called confirmation of the Articles, the passage fraudulently omitted in the second of them, and ordered by the King to be re-inserted in its proper place, is omitted; as is also the clause which guaranteed to the Catholics the exercise of their several trades and professions. It omits the fourth Article altogether. And what is very important, it remits the benefit of the indemnity, as granted by the sixth Article, to a period subsequent to the 10th of April, 1689, and thereby enables all persons who suffered any injuries between the 5th of November, 1688, and 10th of April 1689, to bring their actions for the same until the 1st of September 1691; for it declares that the commencement of the war referred to in the said Article, was the 10th of April 1689, and not the 5th of November, 1688. The 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th Articles are wholly omitted. Thus were the Irish Catholics robbed of rights which by solemn treaty belonged to them; but be it remembered that in the above preamble the Parliament claims the King's authority for the robbery.

Persons have been found to excuse William, for permitting the violation of the Articles of Limerick. There can be no excuse for the violation of a treaty, but the impossibility of fulfilling it. This is true of all treaties, but especially so of such a one as that of Limerick, on which the freedom of a nation depended. If a man sells a horse, say for £20, and delivers the horse to the purchaser, surely he is entitled to the £20. Hence, when the Irish army delivered up Limerick on certain conditions, signed and sealed in the most solemn manner, the price should be paid, which was the fulfilment of the conditions on which it was delivered up. Those conditions were the relaxation of penal laws. They were not only not relaxed, but new ones were enacted in violation of the Articles. It was beyond the power of King or Parliament to curtail or alter such a treaty. To do so was to obtain goods under false pretences, and then refuse to pay for them, a crime punishable by the laws of every civilized nation. If the Parliament did not like the terms of the treaty, they had no power to set them aside, without putting the other contracting parties in the same position which they held before the treaty was made. This could not be done, and there was, therefore, no course open but to fulfil the terms of treaty. It is put forward in William's defence that he was

* The italics are the Author's.

compelled to yield to the wishes of the Anti-Irish and Protestant party. Such logic would go to justify the violation of any contract. All required for the purpose would be to bring sufficient pressure to bear on one of the parties, who could then declare that he dared not fulfil his engagements. But William was in no such difficulty. Was he not the King? Could any subject presume to come into his presence and ask him to break his royal word, to repudiate his solemn engagements, made to the vast majority of the subjects of one of his kingdoms? Could he not have refused to sign the Law of 1697, by which the Articles of Limerick were flagrantly violated? He had done such things before. Did he not on two occasions threaten to return to Holland, if certain things of which he disapproved, were done? When he was taking the coronation oath of Scotland, and had come to the clause, by which he was to promise to root out heretics, he stopped the Earl of Argyle, who was administering the oath, and declared that he did not intend to bind himself to become a persecutor. The Commissioners said that such was not the meaning of the oath. "Well," said William, "I take it in that sense only."* In 1692, a bill passed both Houses of the English Parliament for establishing triennial Parliaments. Yet, William, not liking such Parliaments, *rejected the bill*. Could he not have acted the same part in Ireland, the weaker country, and therefore the less dangerous to him? But to set the matter quite at rest, the Irish Parliament, as stated above, alleged truly, no doubt, the King's authority for altering the Articles of Limerick, as they deemed fit. They did so, and he, the King, approved of their action, by his royal signature.

The establishment of the woollen manufacture in Ireland dates from the time of Edward III.; and long before William became King of England, it was the staple trade of this country. Grazing had been a large and profitable industry, but at the instance of English agriculturists, a law was passed to prevent the sending of Irish cattle into England, which compelled the Irish to give greater attention to sheep farming than they had previously done. Wool, for which a ready sale was obtained in England, became very plenty. But this piece of prosperity also awakened the jealousy of English farmers, and they called for legislation against it. No Act specially directed against it was passed, but its free exportation was much interfered with by a rule that it should be only sent to certain ports in England from certain other ports in Ireland. These things, however, although important in

* Dalrymple, Vol. I., p. 327.

themselves, were inconsiderable when compared with the sweeping and destructive legislation against the exportation of Irish woollens. The bill dealing with this subject was brought into the House of Commons in 1697, but was not passed until 1699.

The English House of Lords, addressing the King in 1698, said, that "the growing manufacture of cloth in Ireland, both by the cheapness of all sorts of necessities for life, and *goodness of materials for making all manner of cloth*, doth invite your subjects of England with their families to leave their habitations to settle there, to the increase of the woollen manufacture in Ireland, which makes your loyal subjects in this kingdom very apprehensive, that *the further growth* of it may greatly prejudice the said manufacture here."* They then beseech his Majesty to declare, in the "most public and effectual" way to his subjects in Ireland, that "the increase of the woollen manufacture there is, and ever will be, the cause of much jealousy to his English subjects," and they call for "very strict laws" that this state of things might be remedied. The King, in his answer to this Address, declares that he "will take care to do what their lordships have desired."† The Commons addressed him in the same strain, adding:—"And we do most humbly implore your Majesty's protection and favour in this matter; and that you will make it your royal care, and enjoin all those you employ in Ireland, to make it their care, and use their utmost diligence, to hinder the *exportation of wool*, except to be imported hither‡ and for discouraging the woollen manufactures, and encouraging the linen manufactures to which we shall be always ready to give our *utmost assistance*."§ To this request the King's answer is very explicit:—"I shall," he says, "do all that in me lies to discourage the woollen trade in Ireland, and encourage the linen manufacture there; and to promote the trade of England."

Next, then, to "the growth of Popery," the growth of wool and woollens in Ireland excited the anger, and called forth the fierce legislation of our English sister; so that the father and founder of the "glorious constitution" of 1688 forbade the Irish Catholics to save their souls, or provide for their bodies, in the way that seemed best to themselves.

The King and English Parliament were thus cordially united

* 9th June, 1698, Lords' [English] Journals, p. 314.

† Ibid., 315.

‡ 30th June, 1698.

§ That is to England, whereas they could get higher prices for their wool in foreign countries.

for the destruction of the woollen manufacture in Ireland; but it was their desire that the bill for that purpose should be passed by the Irish Parliament. So, on the first day of the Parliamentary session of 1698 (27th September), the Lords Justices with a duplicity that would be more truly described by a shorter word, told the Parliament that a bill had been transmitted (from the English Privy Council) "for *the encouragement of the linen and hempen manufacture*," adding that "the settlement of this manufacture will contribute much to people the country, and will be found *much more advantageous to this kingdom* than the woollen manufacture, which being the settled staple trade of England, *from whence all foreign markets* are supplied, can never be encouraged *here* for that purpose."^{*} This sinister mode of introducing the subject did not deceive the Irish Commons, and they only promised "their hearty endeavours to encourage a linen and hempen manufacture in Ireland; and they further hoped to find such a temperament in respect to the woollen trade that the same might not be injurious to England."^{*} The subject was referred to the Committee of Supply, which resolved that "an additional duty should be laid on old and new drapery manufactured in Ireland, and exported to England (friezes excepted)." To this the House agreed. Petitions soon began to be presented both against this duty and the amount of it. The Committee proceeded in a slow, dilatory manner, expecting, probably, that public opinion against the impost would grow stronger. Those in England who had resolved to seize the Irish woollen trade for themselves would not brook delay, and became impatient, and the Lords-Justices, doubtless inspired by them, went down to the House to urge despatch with regard to the bill, saying, amongst other things—"We thought the greatest mark we could give of our kindness and concern for you was, to come hither and desire you to hasten the dispatch of the matters under your consideration, in which we are the more earnest, because we must be sensible that if the present opportunity of his Majesty's affection to you hath put into your hands be lost, it seems hardly to be recovered."[†] The Committee resolved to consider a duty to be laid on the woollen manufacture, but neither William nor his English friends were prepared to await consideration. So the Lords-Justices sent a message next day with a bill cut and dry, saying they had his Majesty's *commands*

^{*} Hutchinson's Commercial Restraints, p. 99.

[†] Ibid., p. 100.

[‡] Com. Jour., 1032.

to have it passed in the present session of Parliament, "inasmuch," they add, "as it may be of great advantage for the preservation of the trade of this kingdom." This was snubbing the Irish Commons and repeating the old untruth. The bill passed without any vigorous opposition, the numbers being 105 for, and only 41 against it. It put 20 per cent. on all broadcloth *exported out of Ireland*, and 10 per cent. on new draperies, friezes excepted. By draperies, it seems, were meant woollen fabrics inferior to broadcloth. But this law was not destructive enough to satisfy the greed of England, and so there was a law passed in the English Parliament in June, 1699, prohibiting in perpetuity the exportation from Ireland of all goods made of or *mixed* with wool, except to England and Wales and with leave of the Commissioners of the revenue. Thus was annihilated the staple manufacture of Ireland.

William was not much of a religious man. His early training in that direction was neither extensive nor profound. The religion he had was drawn from the atmosphere in which he lived, rather than from any course of instruction. He had a natural taste for the military life, and was anxious to gain distinction as a soldier, but the circumstances in which he found himself compelled him to devote more time to the planning of political combinations than to the science of war; for some powerful European league in which Holland would be a factor was absolutely necessary to enable him to resist the enemies who threatened, not only the existence of his little principality, but the independence of all Holland. His dread, his aversion, his *bête noire* was Louis XIV. No wonder. That powerful and warlike King dashed across the Rhine in 1672, with an army so powerful that the Dutch could not offer it even a feeble resistance. He crossed at a lonely, undefended place, near where the Yssel parts from the Rhine, his whole cavalry taking the water, although the horses had to swim a considerable portion of it at the centre.* He overran Holland. All the troops the Dutch could spare from their fortresses could do no more than watch his movements. To get him away they had to sacrifice a vast amount of property by opening the sluices and laying the country under water. The Dutch had risen to importance some time before the invasion of Louis, and were very proud of the part they took in the Triple Alliance, which led to the treaty of Aix la

* Louis proposed to take the river at the head of the guards, but was dissuaded from doing so by the Prince de Condé, who in such an event would, in honour, be obliged to follow him; but the great Condé had the gout, and he feared cold water to his feet, more than he did the bullets or sabres of the enemy. — *Life and Times of Louis XIV.* By G. P. R. James, Vol. II., p. 184.

Chapelle, in 1668. They even affected a contempt for Louis, by calling him "the King of Reviews," because he was fond of military display. But he gave a terrible emphasis to the sneer, after crossing the Rhine; for his triumphant progress through their country was more like a review than real warfare. Not long after this he levelled the walls of Orange to the ground. This William never forgave. It so rankled in his heart that he was afterwards heard to say, "he hoped to live to make Louis feel what it was to insult a Prince of Orange;" and there can be no doubt that his anxiety to become King of England had its deepest root in this desire, as it would place resources at his disposal to gratify it. After coming to England he formed what is known in history as the Grand Alliance, which consisted of the Emperor, the States-General of Holland, and William himself. He has been much praised for this combination, but although it inflicted many severe losses on France, it failed to secure the objects for which it was formed, and the peace of Ryswick left France as powerful as ever. As a soldier William had many valuable qualities. He was brave, far-seeing to provide for eventualities, patient, and although he felt defeat as keenly as any man, he did not allow himself to be too much cast down by it. But he was not a great captain, and his victories were neither many nor brilliant. No one thought of comparing him with Turenne, Condé, Villiers, or any of the first-class generals of France, who were his cotemporaries. He was one of the most mysterious and incommunicative of men. His speeches to his Parliament are models of vague obscurity, which they sometimes resented in the most decided manner. He had favourites, but did his best to conceal his attachment to them. In this he failed, because the lavish way in which he squandered the forfeited lands upon them, to the neglect of many who aided in bringing him to the throne, revealed them in spite of him. Meanwhile the people were over-burthened with taxes to pay his war expenses.*

* See Note F.

CHAPTER XXV.

REIGN OF ANNE.*

VARIED and well planned as were the persecutions inflicted on Ireland for generations before the reign of Anne, it was reserved for her and her advisers to fashion a penal code notorious in our history for its ingenious wickedness. This monarch is said to have been kindly and amiable, although self-willed and choleric at times, but always too easily influenced by those she trusted. Hence she was continually in the hands of some favourite. Sarah Jennings, the famous Duchess of Marlborough, ruled her, and through her the nation, for many years. She obtained for her husband such favours as he desired. She gave away places under the Crown in abundance, for which, according to common report, she exacted high prices; and the allegation derives force from the fact, that she died worth £3,000,000—a sum equal in value to double the amount at the present time.

Anne was the youngest daughter of James II. by his first wife, Anne Hyde. She was married to Prince George of Denmark, a lazy nonentity, whose chief merit was that he did not trouble himself about affairs, and perhaps had not capacity enough to take an interest in them. His wife, by an act of silliness, not excusable even in a wife, had him made Admiral of the fleet, although he was incapable of commanding a cockboat. Anne, notwithstanding that she was so nearly allied to William III. by blood and marriage, was coldly treated by him—neglected in fact—during his reign. She had sense enough to bear this neglect, as well as her forced retirement from public business, about which she was never consulted. She ascended the throne in the

* This princess had few qualities worthy of admiration or respect. She was frequently ill, and the illness was usually put down as gout, which no doubt was true. The cause of the gout was never alluded to, but tradition says, she was too fond of stimulants. In a letter of Peter Wentworth's in the Wentworth Papers [1705-1739], the real cause was given, but the Editor suppressed it, adding this footnote:—"Here follows a paragraph about Dr. Alburtnight and the state of the Queen's health, *expressed in the plainest terms.*" This passage is very suggestive.—*Wentworth Papers* (1883), p. 302. On the statue of Anne in front of St. Paul's (lately removed) some wicked wit once scribbled the following distich:—

"Here stands Queen Anne, left England in the lurch,
With her face to the brandy shop—her back to the church."

thirty-eighth year of her age, and was soon popular with the nation—far more than ever her predecessor was, who, during the time he reigned in England, seemed to feel like a man in a strange land, his true country and home being Holland. The people of England were much of the same opinion. So that instead of being united by mutual confidence, they used each other for their own separate ends. William employed the resources of England—men and money—to fight the battles of Holland; the Protestants of England made use of William to keep out the Pope and the Pretender. Anne gets credit for having been a woman of superior piety—a reputation easily acquired in her time, when the whole Church of England, lay and cleric, appears to have sunk into a state of spiritual lethargy. Her father, who loved her much, was anxious about her religion, especially towards the close of his life, but she remained firm as a rock in her Protestant belief. This was all fair enough, if she were only tolerant, but she had a horror of dissent, and perhaps she is not much to be blamed for this, when the highest Protestant intellects in the land, either could not see, or refused to see, that all Protestantism is based on dissent, or, in other words, on the right of private judgment, and that Dissenters of every kind are as justified in breaking away from the English Church as that Church itself was in severing itself from the Catholic Church. Protestants cut the ground completely from under their own feet, when they persecute people for following their independent judgment in matters of religion.

But there was a special reason why Anne should hesitate long before she would sign penal laws against the Catholics of Ireland. They were her father's loyal subjects and supporters; they never ceased to regard him as their King; they fought and bled for him; and had been the faithful defenders of his house against Cromwell and the Parliament, as well as against William. Perhaps she could not save them from all persecution, but she could have modified it by showing an aversion to it, whereas she left them to their merciless enemies without the slightest indication of sympathy.

At her accession, the Earl of Rochester was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. In those days it was usual with our Chief Governors to remain out of this country as much as possible, and some of them never came over at all. Rochester, following this custom, kept about the Court, lest his influence should go down and his interests be forgotten in his absence. Anne thinking it unbecoming in him to be absent from his important post, sent him a message to prepare to go to Ireland. Having taken some days for consideration, he placed his resignation in her Majesty's

hands. She readily accepted it, and to succeed him immediately appointed the Duke of Ormonde who was then in high favour, after his successes at Vigo. Ormonde was a name of ill omen to Ireland, and such it proved to be in this instance.*

Before entering upon the legislation of Anne's first Irish Parliament against the Catholics, it is well to premise, that there was nothing in their conduct to call for such legislation. They showed no disloyalty. While England, and Scotland still more, were hotly engaged in promoting the cause of the Pretender, the Catholics of Ireland, so far from joining in the feeling, did not manifest by any act of theirs the least attachment to him. They were prostrate in the dust. They were ruined and utterly incapable of any effort, even if they had the desire to make one. The ferocious statutes against them, as Burke called them, were not the result of fear, but of security. The dominant faction, in the insolence of their success, trampled upon the Catholics for the mean, diabolic pleasure it afforded them. In the preamble to the Act of 1703-4 there are no fears of rebellion expressed, no

* This was James, second and last Duke of Ormonde. He was the son of Thomas, Earl of Ossory, and grandson of the first Duke, in whose house he was brought up. At an early age he adopted the military profession, in which he became distinguished. When the combined fleets of England and Holland attacked Vigo in 1702, he had command of the military forces, consisting of 12,000 men, who after having landed, found immense booty, which they carried off. Part of this booty consisted of about 50 tons of superior snuff, stored there, and at Port St. Mary. Having been brought home it was sold at a cheap rate. This gave the first great stimulus to snuff-taking in England, where the habit was little known before.—(*Ashton's Social Life in the Reign of Queen Anne*, p. 158). Ormonde was twice Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—1703 to 1707, and 1711 to 1713. When Marlborough fell into disgrace, Ormonde succeeded him as general of the allied forces in the war against France. The Dutch did not like the change, and joined Prince Eugene in the command with him. Meantime the Queen and her advisers, especially St. John, the Foreign Secretary, resolved to conclude a separate peace with France, unknown to the Allies, and sent secret orders to Ormonde to delay, as best he could, active hostilities. This placed him in a most embarrassing position, as the other commanders were anxious to open the campaign. On various pleas he avoided attacking the French, and England having obtained from Louis XIV. terms deemed satisfactory, Ormonde returned home. The whole affair was most disgraceful to Anne and her ministers. Ormonde was not to blame, as the orders from his government were peremptory. St. John, afterwards Lord Bolingbroke, who managed this business was that St. John whom Pope addresses in the opening lines of his *Essay on Man*. The tact and ability, shown by Ormonde in this miserable affair, gave great satisfaction to the Queen and government, but it led to his ruin. On the accession of George I., he was deprived of his offices, and fled to France. He was impeached for his conduct in the war; the charges were proved; he was attainted of high treason; his name erased from the list of peers, and from the order of the Garter. The Irish Parliament set £10,000 upon his head, and his estate was vested in the Crown. Spain allowed him £1,500 a year, to maintain him, and he spent the remainder of his days in the cause of the Pretender. He died in 1758.—*Conduct of the Duke of Ormonde in the Campaign of 1712*. London, 1748. *Webb's Compendium of Irish Biography*, p. 63.

trials of disaffection or conspiracy. The Act is simply called "An Act to prevent the further growth of Popery"—not because it was dangerous or disaffected to the State, but because *it was Popery*. The Duke of Ormonde opened the session on 1st September, 1703, in a short and rather jaunty speech, in which he told the Collective Wisdom that the heads of excellent bills had come from England, and that the Queen effectually manifested her tender concern for them in giving them an opportunity of passing those gracious bills, "and of making such other laws, as may yet be wanting for the establishment of the Protestant religion, and the welfare of the kingdom."* It has been made matter of discussion whether the English or Irish Parliament is the more responsible for the Act against the further growth of Popery. The thing is of little consequence; but both seem equally responsible. No doubt the question led to much correspondence between them, but each seems to have been determined to put an effectual stop to the growth of Popery. Burnet says the Irish Parliament were so anxious for the bill that it "was offered to the Duke of Ormonde, [they] pressing him with more than usual vehemence to intercede so effectually, that it might be returned back under the great seal of England."† The English Parliament, then in session, set so much importance on the bill that ministers judged it unsafe to refuse it, but they added a clause to it "that none in Ireland should be capable of any employment, or of being in the magistracy in any city, who did not qualify themselves by receiving the Sacrament, according to the Test Act passed in England." The object of this clause was to have the bill rejected in Ireland, as the Presbyterians of Ulster would not submit to this test. If they did, they could hold no official employment, a privation which the Irish Parliament would not, it was presumed, think of inflicting upon them. Yet the Irish Houses regarded the Act as so valuable against Papists, that that Parliament passed it—test clause and all, although there were many influential Dissenters in the House of Commons. The Dissenters petitioned against the Act on account of that clause, but on receiving a promise that the said clause would be repealed on the first opportunity, they withdrew their opposition; yet it was not repealed for many a year, and was often put in force against them. After the Hanoverian succession, the clause was either "artfully evaded or benignly connived at," as far as the Dissenters were concerned.‡

* Irish Commons' Journals, 1703.

† Burnet, reign of Anne, 1703.

‡ Curry's Civil Wars, Vol II., p. 236.

Colonel Eyre, Mr. Tenison, Sir Francis Blundell, and Mr. Singleton were appointed to draft the bill. The Parliament met on the 1st of September, 1703. The heads of the bill were laid on the table of the House of Commons by Mr. Tenison, on the 19th November, and it received the Royal Assent in March, 1704. This long delay proves how much discussion went on about it, between the English and Irish House of Commons.

The penal laws against the Irish Catholics, as a modern Protestant historian has truly said, were "deliberately intended to demoralize as well as degrade."* Hence Section 3 of this Act turns the child into a rebel against the parent, for it is therein enacted that, "Lest children of Popish parents, who have professed, *or are willing to profess*, the Protestant religion should be cast off by their parents, or disinherited by them," it is lawful for the Court of Chancery, on being applied to, to order a suitable maintenance for every such Protestant child. Thus was the child made the master of the parent, with power to put him into Chancery, if he did not allow him to do as he pleased. To suppose that children in such cases became Protestants through conviction is an utter absurdity. Not one in a hundred of them could have the opportunity, and not one in a thousand the ability and education to study and weigh the dogmas of the adverse creeds. Moreover—wonderful absurdity!—no age was specified at which a child could become a Protestant; so it could be done at any age. Religious conviction had nothing to do with the matter, and the more froward and vicious the child, the greater likelihood would there be of his "conversion." Look at the converse of this: one of the reasons for this bill, given in the preamble, is, that "some Protestants had been perverted to Popery," a crime of course, calling aloud for punishment; but the conversion or pretended conversion of Papists to Protestantism was an act so holy and praiseworthy, that it entitled children at any age, to trample upon the most sacred rights and the tenderest feelings of human nature. From the beginning of religious persecution in Ireland, a leading feature of it was to get hold of the heirs of estated Catholics, and make them Protestants. Such was the sole object of the nefarious Court of Wards; and the same cunningly

* Lecky's History of England in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. I., p. 283.

The Act against the further growth of Popery "has the reputation of being the most energetic of all the measures, devised by Anglo-Saxon ingenuity, for ridding the land of this spiritual pestilence. The English Parliament had, in 1699, given birth to an enactment of no gentle nature. . . . But the Irish Act far outstripped the English in ferocity and cunning. In truth it stopped short only at the point of direct confiscation of the estates of Roman Catholics."—Wyon's History of England during the Reign of Queen Anne, Vol. I., pp. 172-3.

devised plan is followed in this act, for in it is enacted, that "should the eldest son become a Protestant, his Popish parent shall become and shall be only a tenant for life of his estate, whether held in feetail or fee simple, and the reversion in fee shall be vested in such son." This section was framed to destroy Catholics of property throughout the kingdom. It made ample and stringent provisions for the perversion of Catholics, and offered the most tempting rewards, if they would only *pretend* to become Protestants.

By the 4th Section the Popish father is debarred, under a penalty of £500, from being a guardian to, or from having the custody of his own children. If the child, though of infantile years, pretends to be a Protestant, it is to be taken from its own father, and put into the hands of a Protestant relation; or if the mother pretends to be a Protestant, the child can be taken and placed with a Protestant to be educated at the Popish father's expense.

In Section 5 special provision is made for protecting the religion of Protestants. It is there provided, "that if any Protestant having an estate real or personal within the Kingdom will intermarry with a Papist, either within the Kingdom or in other places out of it, he shall be subject to the penalties of 9 William III."*

The first oath prescribed by this Act contains the usual declaration against Transubstantiation, the invocation of the Blessed Virgin and saints. A second oath had to be taken against the Pretender.

The 6th Section renders Papists incapable of purchasing any manors, tenements, hereditaments, or any rents or profits arising out of the same; or of holding any lease of lives, or other lease whatever, for any term exceeding thirty-one years; but if such farm produced a profit *greater than one-third of the rent*, the right in it ceased, and passed over to the first Protestant who *discovered* the rate of profit.

The 7th Section deprived Papists of any inheritance, devise, gift, remainder or trust of any lands, tenements, etc., of which any Protestant was, or should be seized in fee simple absolute, or fee tail, and which, by the death of such Protestant, or his wife, *ought* to descend to his son or other issue in tail, and makes them descend to the nearest Protestant relation, the same as if the popish heir and other popish relations were dead.

By the 10th Section, if a Papist has no Protestant heir, his estate is to be divided, share and share alike among all his

* See page 498.

sons, or in the absence of sons, amongst his daughters, and failing these, among the collateral kindred of his father. The object of this is plain: it was to prevent the Irish from having amongst them any man who could assume a position of authority or leadership; in fact, to make us a nation of peasants, and as far as possible, of paupers.*

Other sections there are of the same import, but we can only find space for the special enactment against Papists being allowed to reside in corporate towns, more especially Limerick and Galway. In Section 23 a portion of the Act of 17th and 18th Charles II. (Section 36.) is recited to the effect that no person or persons are to be allowed to possess any houses within any corporate town, or take any lease thereof, but such as should take the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, without the license of the Chief Governor or Governors of the Kingdom and Privy Council. Section 23 then proceeds, "And whereas, the peace and safety of this Kingdom and the welfare of her Majesty's Protestant subjects will much depend on the security of the city of Limerick and town of Galway, and of their being in possession of her Majesty's Protestant subjects, and being considerable garrisons in this her Majesty's Kingdom; be it enacted that no person or persons that are or shall be Papists, or profess the popish religion, shall or may after the 24th day of March, in the Year of Our Lord 1703-4, take or purchase any house or tenement, or come to dwell or inhabit within the said city of Limerick, or within the town of Galway, or suburbs thereof; and that every person of the popish religion now inhabiting within the said city or suburbs of Limerick, or within the said town or suburbs of Galway, shall, before the said 24th of March next ensuing, before the Chief Magistrate of the said respective city or town, become bound to her Majesty, her heirs and successors with two sufficient securities, in a reasonable penal sum to be assessed by the Chief Magistrate, recorder and sheriffs of the said city and town respectively, or any two of them, with

* "The position in which they [the English] wished to see Ireland, was that of a dependent province, occupied in growing unlimited wool for the English looms, with the relations of its inhabitants to one another, and to England so adjusted, that they could never more be politically dangerous. If they could not eradicate Popery, the Government believed that they could establish a system which would condemn the professors of it to helplessness."—Henry Maxwell (an author of the time) quoted in Froude's *English in Ireland*. Vol. I., p. 293.

The Irish elections closed yesterday (11 Dec. 1885), and out of the 103 members assigned to Ireland by the late Franchise Bill, the descendants of those popish peasants, so "condemned to helplessness," as it was hoped, have sent 85 of their number to represent them in the Imperial Parliament.

condition of his or her faithfully bearing themselves towards her Majesty, her heirs and successors, or in default of giving such security, such persons shall depart out of the said city, suburbs, and town aforesaid, on or before the 25th day of March, in the Year of Our Lord, 1705."

Lord Kingsland, Colonel Brown, and other leading Catholics petitioned to be heard by Counsel against the bill. The prayer of the petition was granted, and Sir Theobald Butler, Mr. Malone, and Sir Stephen Rice appeared at the bar of the Lords and Commons as counsel for the Catholics. Sir Theobald Butler was the chief speaker. He took the Act, clause after clause, and proved it was a direct violation of the Articles of Limerick. The answer to all their pleading is, perhaps, the finest specimen of contemptuous insolence extant. The Catholics were told that if they were deprived of the benefits of the Articles of Limerick, it was their own fault, since, by *conforming to the established religion*, they would be entitled to these and many other benefits; that therefore they ought not to blame any but themselves: that the passing of that bill into a law was needful for the security of the Kingdom at that juncture, and, in short, that there was nothing in the Articles of Limerick that should hinder them from passing it.*

In spite of the ingenuity of the Irish Parliament, the wicked Papists eluded or tried to elude the Act against the growth of Popery, and save themselves from robbery and annihilation. On account of this treasonable villany, an Act of Explanation was considered necessary, and so in 1709 such an Act was prepared, and of course became the law of the land. In its first section, inasmuch as the Papists had eluded the Act against the further growth of Popery by granting annuities for lives in tail and fee simple, it is stated—"Be it therefore enacted that no Papist, nor any person or persons in trust for a Papist, shall, from and after the tenth day of May, 1709, be capable to take, have, etc., any annuity for life or term of years determinable on any life or lives, or for any greater or lesser estate any ways chargeable on lands, tenements, etc." Such things done for and "perfected" to any Papist or Papists, are declared null and void. By Section 3 of the Act against the further growth of Popery, a child that declared itself a Protestant, should, according to law, be supported by the Popish father, and the Court of Chancery, on being appealed to, had power to charge the father's property with such support. The suspicion, more or less well founded, arose that

* Debates on the Popery Bill, 2nd of Anne.

such fathers concealed or endeavoured to conceal their full income, in order to reduce to the smallest amount the sum exacted from them for that purpose; but such a proceeding is made impossible by the 3rd Section of the Act of amendment, which lays down that the court has power "to oblige the said parent or parents to discover, upon oath, the full value of all his, her, or their estate, as well personal as real, clear above incumbrances, and *bona fide* debts contracted *before the enrollment* of the Protestant bishop's certificate in court, declaring the child to be a Protestant." Thereupon the court is empowered to allot such provisions for the maintenance of such children as seems good to it, the whole being hedged in and protected by provisions against what are termed fraudulent gifts, leases, etc. By the 4th Section of the principal Act it was declared that if the mother became a Protestant, or pretended to do so, the child could be taken and placed with a Protestant, to be brought up as a Protestant at the Popish father's expense. It did not seem to the framers of the Act of Explanation that this made the wife sufficiently independent of her husband; it is, therefore, enacted by the 14th Section that the Popish wife who becomes a Protestant (or pretends to do so) can get a jointure out of the property of her husband, if he refused or refuses to make such jointure. Thus were the members of every Catholic household bribed to rise in rebellion, and set at defiance the natural head of that household.

"Several Protestant schoolmasters," says the 16th section of the Act of Explanation, "to increase their schools, combine with Papists, rather than prosecute Popish schoolmasters, and take them in as ushers, assistants, &c., therefore, be it enacted, that such Catholic usher, assistant, &c., when found out, shall be regarded as a Popish regular clergyman, and prosecuted as such." This was to increase his punishment, for by an Act of William III., all regulars, when caught, were to be imprisoned, until they could be transported beyond the seas. To return afterwards was high treason, the punishment for which, of course, was death. And that they and others of higher rank might be caught, the discoverer received £50 for an Archbishop, Bishop, or Vicar-General, or any person exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The sum for the discovery of a regular priest or friar was £20, and by this law, the same sum was given for a Catholic usher, assistant, &c., and the same punishment awaited them. *All those rewards were to be levied off the Popish inhabitants of the county in which the parties were arrested.* Any person refusing to give testimony about his having heard Mass, where he heard it, &c., got a year's imprisonment. A common trick of

the discoverers was to pretend to be good Catholics, anxious to assist at Mass, and thereby learn from the unsuspecting, where Mass was to be celebrated on a given Sunday or Holiday; for it was seldom twice in the same place; and guards were always set, lest the minions of authority should surprise the priest and his congregation during the celebration of the sacred mysteries. But these guards were, of course, ineffective against the hypocritical discoverers, who managed to become members of the congregation. Yet was there some protection against them, for a large sheet or screen of some kind was usually suspended between the celebrating priest and the congregation, in the sand pit, or quarry, or cavern in which he celebrated, so that he could not be identified in case of arrest and prosecution. Thus was the old rood-screen turned to painful utility in Ireland.

The Act of Explanation consists of 39 clauses, all evidently prepared with the most elaborate care. It and the Act against the further growth of Popery, of which it is called an explanation, taken together, contain a system of legal persecution, such as one may look for in vain in the statute book of any civilized country.

These Acts gave birth to a new progeny of discoverers. Their occupation was to find out some violation of the acts with regard to the possession or transfer of property by Catholics, bring the unfortunate accused into Court, and if the allegation were proved, be adjudged the owners of the property about which they had made the discovery. In some cases it became vested in the Crown, but they were of rare occurrence. Those discoverers became infamous in the eyes of every man who had any sense of honour and justice, but they were not only recognized by the Government, but were regarded as important and necessary instruments for the carrying out of the anti-Popery Acts; and a resolution was put upon the journals of the House of Commons, "That the prosecuting of, and informing against Papists was an honourable service to the Government."* Could infamy be turned into honour, and robbery changed to justice and honesty by such a resolution! In Howard's Popery Cases, numbering over one hundred, a discoverer is, as far as I can make out, in every instance the plaintiff, and the unfortunate rightful owner the defendant.† The Court was always in

* Com. Journ. 3. 319.

† Howard's book contains only a few specimen cases of the hundreds that were filed in the different Courts, under the Popery Laws, which were in full swing when his book was published in 1775. One of the reported cases happened

favour of the discoverer, and the common constitutional principle, that penal laws are to be interpreted *strictly*, was violated in his favour. The reasons given by the judges for such violation are extremely curious. In the case of Ogle and Ogle against Archbold, in which a Protestant woman married a Papist, the Lord Chancellor in giving judgment for the discoverer said, "I think this is a plain forfeiture of these £500 by this marriage, and though this is a penal law, yet it is not to be construed as other penal laws, for it is a *remedial* law also, and made to prevent a mischief from the increase of Papists in this Kingdom."* In the case of Brogden against Murray the same principle was laid down by the Attorney-General. Counsellor Daly, for the defence, contended, that the Popery laws, being penal laws, should not, on the ground of being remedial laws, have the wide construction contended for, inasmuch as the 25 Edward III., which is the statute of treason, might be regarded as remedial, but that it was "never enlarged upon that pretence." This argument was not so much as noticed by the other side!† In the case of Clarke against Parsons and others, Baron Momtney laid it down with pious unction, that these Acts "were not to be considered as penal laws, but for the advancement of religion, and to be extended to promote that end."‡

It is needless to say that a Papist, pure and simple, could not be a discoverer, but I may state, that a man could not be a discoverer if *one* of his parents was a Papist, "unless he had been constantly bred a Protestant from twelve years of age; and a Protestant who intermarried with a Papist was incapable of being a discoverer, the Court holding that such a Protestant is a more odious Papist within the Acts, than a real and actual Papist by profession and principle."§

But nothing can more clearly show the state of the Irish Catholics under the statutes of William III. and Anne than the kindly meant, but timid, halting appeal made by Mr. Howard in his Preface, for some little relaxation of those laws. He says, they have greatly strengthened the Protestant interest in this country,

but two years before, in 1773. The work is entitled "*Several Special Cases on the Laws against the further growth of Popery in Ireland.*" It was not published with any political or historical object; but solely for the use of lawyers.

* Howard's Popery Cases, p. 18.

† Ibid., pp. 22, 23.

‡ Ibid., p. 102.

§ Ibid., p. 60.

and "have been of real great advantage to it;" but he believes "there is not the same good reason for continuing, as there was for making these laws, and that it might be prudent now to relax them something," especially as "they tend to reprobate the mind by encouraging informers, those horrid pests to society and to preserve eternal jealousies and enmity between the subjects to the same Prince, and in the same country; nay, and in families, between father and son, and brother and brother, is (I believe), as undoubtedly true, as it is also, that they considerably prevent the improvement and increase of its husbandry, commerce, and trade." Kind words, indeed. But how suggestive are they of the state of the Catholics whom this good-hearted Protestant tried, in merest pity, to relieve.*

It might be supposed that the anti-Popery code of William III. and Anne would be regarded as abundantly sufficient to abolish Popery in Ireland, but the handful of timid tyrants who presumed to call themselves the nation, never felt at ease except when they were forging new chains for the Catholics, or strengthening and tightening the old ones. Through the reigns of the three Georges, penal legislation went on with scarcely any intermission. In the second year of George the First's reign, a law was passed with an apparently harmless, and even a useful object. It was called an Act to make the militia of the kingdom more useful; but like a velvet paw, sharp claws were masked under this title. The preamble states that no Papist is to be received into the force, either as officer or private. By the IV. and XVIII. Sections it is enacted, that the militia is to be supported by a tax, of which Papists are to pay double as much as Protestants. This was for a force more likely to shoot them down for a slight cause, or for no cause at all, than to afford them protection. For the militia a number of horses were necessary. So to meet this requirement it was enacted that the horses of Papists could be seized, carried away and detained for ten days [evidently to test their qualities], after which the owner was obliged to accept £5 for his horse, if retained; if not retained, the animal was returned, provided the owner paid down the sum demanded for the *trouble of seizing and taking away his horse, and for his keep* during the ten days! If it was proved that a Papist had concealed his horse from the militia authorities, he was fined £10 and cast into jail, "without trial or mainprize," until it was paid. Of this sum, one-half went to support the militia, the other to reward the informer. Each Papist allowed to live in a city or town, was bound to find "an approved Pro-

* Mr. Howard's Preface to his Popery Cases.

testant to become a militia man in his stead." If he refused or neglected to do so, his fine was double that of a Protestant in corresponding circumstances. By 2 George I., c. 19, no Papist could vote for a member of Parliament unless he had taken the oath of Allegiance and Abjuration six months before the election. But this did not necessarily take away from the Catholics the power of voting, as the oath of Abjuration was taken against the Pretender of the House of Stuart, and the bulk of Irish Catholics had ceased to have any objection to it. It was reserved for the next reign to completely deprive them of the elective franchise.*

We have just seen what pains and penalties were inflicted on the Catholics under the simple title of "a bill to make the militia more useful." The trick was repeated with regard to the Act which disfranchised them for over sixty years. It is called "An Act for furthering the election of members of Parliament, and preventing the irregular proceedings of Sheriffs and other officers in electing and returning such members." Primate Boulter, who was indefatigable in strengthening the Protestant interest in Ireland, and crushing the Papists, is credited with getting the disfranchising clause inserted in the bill. According to the common opinion it was not originally in it. The whole section runs as follows:—VII. "And for the better preventing of Papists from voting in elections, be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that no Papist, though not convict, shall be entitled or admitted to vote at the election of any member to serve in Parliament as knight, citizen or Burgess, or at the election of any magistrate for any city or other town corporate; any law, statute, or usage to the contrary notwithstanding."†

The Irish Parliament met in December 1727, and passed several very severe measures against the Catholics, but none of them had such deadly and far-reaching effects as the famous disfranchising clause of the above-named Act. It was very secretly managed and we have only traditional information respecting it. It is, however, recorded in the Journals of the House that on the 9th of February the bill was reported as having been approved of by a Committee of the whole House, "*with some amend-*

* The oath of Abjuration was passed in the last year of the reign of William III. There is a curious error in the marginal summary of the Act of 2 George I., C. 19, the oath of *Supremacy* being inserted there (which Catholics could not take) instead of the oath of *Abjuration*, which is in the Section itself.

† George II. Irish Statutes, Vol. V., Cap. 9. This Act passed the Commons, 30th April, 1728, O.S.; the House of Lords, 30th April, and received the Royal Assent 6th May.

ments." Of those amendments the disfranchising clause is believed to be one. Many writers think they find some explanation or excuse for the passing of this clause, in the fact that it was passed under a false title ; but they deceive themselves, for it would have passed under any title. The bill, moreover, like every other bill, was twice read in each house, clause after clause, by the clerk at the table, before it was finally assented to. So that although the title was calculated to deceive the public, it could not deceive the members of either House of Parliament. There is another and a better reason for the secrecy : Catholic powers in friendly relations with England sometimes remonstrated through their Ambassadors, against the Penal Laws passed against its Catholic subjects. Boulter, in one of his letters,* tells us it was they who were meant to be deceived by the title, and the Primate was just the man to manage such a piece of State-craft. Further, the Bill was passed in both Houses unanimously ; for in the Journals of the House of Lords there is no dissent recorded, as would have been the case had there been any such to record ; and in the Commons' Journals we are informed, in terms, that the Bill passed their House "*nemine contradicente*."

Moved by the fears of a war with France Parliament restored the elective franchise to the Catholics in 1793, after they had been politically dead for two full generations. Is it any wonder that their descendants exult and glory in their triumphs of to-day ?†

From the beginning of the battle, proselytizing education is to be found side by side with coercive legislation. Elizabeth established diocesan free schools for Irish Catholics, who, the Act says, "lived in a rude and barbarous state, not understanding that Almighty God hath, by His divine law, forbidden," &c. Half the cost of those schools was to be supplied by the

* Letter to Duke of Newcastle, March 7th, 1727.

† It has been truly said that Boulter's position in Ireland was more political than ecclesiastical. He was Lord-Justice thirteen times, and his recommendations were accepted in England as oracles. He did much for the English and Protestant interest in this country, by promoting legislation against the Papists, by getting churches, especially chapels of ease, built, and the income of small livings increased. Still that hateful, but indomitable, thing, Popery, held its ground. Writing to the Duke of Newcastle he says :—"The bulk of our clergy have neither parsonage-houses nor glebes, and yet till we can get more churches or chapels, and more resident clergymen, *instead of getting ground of the Papists, we must lose to them*, as, in fact, we do in many places, the descendants of many of Cromwell's officers and soldiers here being gone off to Popery."—Letters, p. 179. Dub. Ed.

Ordinaries of the dioceses in which they were, the other by the dioceses. Next came the Royal free schools of James I., founded in connection with his scheme for the plantation of Ulster. They were mildly described as being for the education of youth in learning and *religion*. Later on it was enacted that the escheated lands for their support were to be conveyed to the bishops of the various dioceses in which they were located. From time to time several others were called into existence at Longford, Banagher, Carysford in Co. Wicklow, Clogher, &c. Between 1608 and 1669 many private persons founded charity schools, the most important of which were those of Erasmus Smith. He was an alderman of London and a grocer. Like hundreds of Englishmen, he, or those whose heir he was, lent money to the Government to embody and pay an army for the reduction of Ireland. The security for the money was, as we have elsewhere seen, forfeited lands in Ireland in proportion to the sums advanced. The investment was a good one, for the lands were given at a very low rate; and, land rising continually in value, Erasmus Smith's foundations in turn became very rich ones.* Erasmus Smith was a charitable man, who tried to do good according to his lights. He founded three schools in different places on his own property, and endowed them with portions of it. There was one near the town of Athlone, to which he assigned 403 acres of land; another in the Isles of Arran, with the larger area of 1467 acres (on account, we may suppose, of the pooriness of the soil); and the third at Galway, with 1011 acres. In these schools, he says, were to be educated "poor children inhabiting upon any part of his lands in Ireland.....who should be brought up in the fear of God and good literature, and to speak the English tongue, and for other good ends." The chief of the other good ends was to make them Protestants, by teaching them Archbishop Ussher's Catechism. He established nine other schools in various places, to prepare children on his property for the University and Trinity College. Nor did he neglect the poor in the same localities, for they were to be taught "to read and write and cast accompts as found capable." The visitation and government of the schools were entrusted to a Board of thirty-two governors, with power to elect their successors. A considerable number of the first thirty-two were Protestant clergymen. One was Henry Jones, a bishop, and afterwards Scoutmaster-General to Cromwell in Ireland. This post,

* I find seven persons named Smith, all of London, in the list of adventurers, but not one named Erasmus, so that this must have been a fancy name assumed by the donor, or perhaps he was only the heir of an Adventurer.

says Ware, was "not decent for one of his function." He was also brother to the famous Michael Jones, who defended Dublin against Ormonde, and gave him the crushing defeat at Rathmines. The governors, even in the lifetime of the founder, began to depart from his intentions, and from the written regulations which he gave for their guidance; so that in June, 1682, we find him addressing them as follows:—"My Lords and Gentlemen, my end in founding the three schooles was to propagate the Protestant faith according to the Scriptures, avoiding all superstition, as the charter and the bye-laws and rules established do direct. Therefore it is the command of His Majesty to catechise the children out of Primate Ussher's Catechism, and to expound the same unto them, which I humbly desire may be observed, on penalty of forfeiting their places..... My Lords, my designe is not to reflect upon any, only I give my judgment, why those schools are so consumptive, which was and is, and will be (if not prevented) the many Popish schooles, their neighbours, which, as succers, do starve the tree. If parents will exclude their children because prayers, catechism, and exposition is commanded, I cannot help it, for to remove that barre, is to make them seminaries of Popery." But when Erasmus Smith was dead and gone, the governors obtained Acts of Parliament to change and modify his intentions. The money accruing from his foundations (always increasing), lay dormant in large sums, was misapplied or malversated; so that when the governors of his schools appeared before the Endowed School Commission, appointed in 1854, they made a very sorry figure, indeed. They had no satisfactory answers to give, when questioned by the Commissioners; they had no satisfactory accounts to produce. All this, however, was in favour of the Catholics, for had the governors managed the large means in their hands with the spirit and energy which the founder hoped they would exhibit, they might have inflicted a great deal more injury on Catholicity in Ireland than they have done.*

Many others I can do little more than name. The Blue Coat Hospital was founded by Charles II. on the petition of the Lord Mayor and citizens of Dublin. The Foundling Hospital for deserted children was established in 1704. Three Classical Seminaries was founded by the Duke of Ormonde, Richard

* Erasmus Smith's Schools : their History and Objects. By the Rev. Wm. Gibson, Professor of Christian Ethics in the Presbyterian College, Belfast, p. 21 et seq. An abridgment of the Report of her Majesty's Commissioners into Unendowed Schools in Ireland. By the Very Rev. A. W. West.

Moore and the Countess of Orkney, a lady who had great influence with William III., and on whom he bestowed 95,000 acres of land in Ireland. Alderman Preston founded a school at Navan and another at Ballyroan. Bishop Foy left the residue of his property for the support of a school at Waterford. Hugh Rainey, Rt. Hon. Wm. Conolly, and Andrew Wilson were also founders of schools, and in 1769 there were fifty-two Charter Schools in Ireland.* So that the remark of a certain English bagman was apt enough when he said, that "Ireland had plenty of Protestant warehouses."

I cannot pass from the Charter Schools without a few remarks. A petition to the Crown was sent through the Protestant Primate, that schools should be more general and that the children of Ireland [*i.e.* the Catholic children of Ireland] should be instructed in the Protestant religion. . . . This led in 1733 to the establishment of the Charter Schools, which were to be supported by estates given for the purpose and by donations. The donations, or rather endowments, were many and large. In 1737, Madam Mercer left her estates to trustees to pay £100 a year to the sick poor of certain parishes in Dublin, and the remainder for Protestant children. "It is deserving of notice that most of the endowments from 1733 to 1781 had for their object the bringing over to the Protestant religion the children of the poor, and preserving them in the same by apprenticing them to Protestants."† They did not of course bring the children to Charter Schools by force; the theory was that they were to be taken in by the consent of their parents. And when miserably poor parents saw grand imposing buildings like colleges (as the Charter Schools were) in which their children were to be lodged, boarded, clothed, and finally taught trades, the inducements were sometimes too great for them. Still the poor people resisted bravely, and the schools seem to have remained unfilled; so that in 1749 we find the Incorporated Society, as the managers of those schools were styled, got passed a *Kidnapping Act*, as it may be called, *which made them the guardians of all begging children, with power to take them up and convey them to the Charter Schools.*‡

There is a preface prefixed to Rev. Mr. Dallas's "Story of the Irish Church Missions to the Roman Catholics," by four gentle-

* It is hardly necessary to state that all these were proselytizing schools, where Catholics who would conform, were far more welcome than Protestants. As far as I can discover, Protestants, as such, were not admitted to the Charter Schools at all.

† Abridgment of the Endowed Schools Commission, by Very Rev. Dean West, pp. 18 and 19. Hodges & Smith, Dublin, 1862.

‡ Ibid., p. 18.

men who call themselves "Members of the English Church." It contains the following passage: "In 1733 the Charter Schools were established under trustees, supported by estates purchased, and large donations, the motto of the corporation being 'Religione et Labore.' The arms were a plough, spade, and an open bible. This was a new sign in Erin's Isle. The priests were furious, refusing the sacraments, and using every means in their power to keep the children away; but these schools carried all before them, and opened a door which all the power and artifice of Rome has not been able to shut."* This is a curious passage to print, as it was printed in 1875. A supernatural power must have, somewhere or another, laid the four worthy members of the English Church in a trance for a long time, as will immediately appear.

The celebrated philanthropist, Mr. Howard, made an inspection of all the Charter Schools in Ireland. Before commencing his inquiries he had received in Dublin a statement from the Incorporated Society, that 2,100 children were maintained in their schools. He found, however, there were only 1,400, and as they were boarding schools, the numbers in attendance did not admit of great fluctuation. Mr. Howard immediately published a very unfavourable account of the Charter Schools, with some details of the various abuses he had discovered in them. This gave rise to a discussion, which caused the Inspector-General of prisons to make an inspection of a large number of these schools in 1786 and 1787, and Mr. Howard repeated his inspection in the latter year. The investigation led to the appointment of a committee of the Lower House, before which he and the Inspector-General and other witnesses were examined, and the result was a complete corroboration of the statements of Mr. Howard. In the latter year the Lord Lieutenant appointed Commissioners for the various schools. They reported of all the schools, royal, diocesan, &c., that "with very few exceptions they were of little use to the public, and totally inadequate to the expectations that might have been justly formed from their large endowments." They further reported that "in many of the Charter Schools, the clothing, cleanliness, food, health, and education of the children have been shamefully neglected."† Thus it was that "they carried all before them."

In the light of these reports and many others, it is only just to admit that had the officials who were intrusted with such enormous funds, been only true to their trust, they could, humanly

* Preface, p. xiv.

† Ibid., p. 20.

speaking, have been far more formidable to the Catholic Church in Ireland than they proved themselves to be.

The result of the discussion that arose out of Mr. Howard's visitation of the Charter Schools was to cause the Government of the day to make important concessions to the Catholics in the matter of education.

The Societies established with the avowed object of making Ireland a Protestant country were very numerous. The bare enumeration of them would fill more than a page of this work. I can only devote a small space to two or three of them.

It has happened a few times since I became a priest on the mission that some charitable English person has sent me a copy of the New Testament through the post. I did not ridicule or despise the act, but I thought it revealed a state of ignorance on the part of Englishmen in reference to the Irish priesthood which I regarded as very sad indeed. The person who took the trouble to send me the New Testament must have persuaded himself that I had never possessed a copy of that inspired volume at all, because, in any other supposition, he must have concluded I would be, at least, as likely to read my own, as one sent me through the post. Moreover, the pious donors of these New Testaments, so anxious to enlighten others, seem to have been strangely ignorant of the efforts which had been made, and are still being made to supply, in the most abundant manner, not priests only, but all the Catholics of Ireland with the word of God. The HIBERNIAN BIBLE Society was founded in 1806, and is still active and flourishing. The 49th Annual Report of this institution is now before me. In it is acknowledged £6,715 5s. 11d., as the receipts of the year. Taking that as an average income, the total received in fifty years (the length of time it had been in existence) would be over £387,484. Nor does the Society seem to have misspent, or lavished the money confided to it, as happened in many other cases; for the result of its labours, since its foundation, is given as follows, at p. 102 of the Report:—Bibles printed and distributed, 1,077,380; New Testaments and Portions, 2,160,284; Total, 3,237,664. But all these were not given away as grants. Some were sold at cost price, some at a reduced price, some given as grants. Taking the present Report as an average one, the grants have been very liberal. Out of 21,516 Bibles, Testaments, and Portions printed in the year, the free grants amounted to 15,066.

With regard to Douay Bibles and Testaments, they have been stereotyped over and over again, and published by the thousand at the lowest possible prices.

As long as well meaning people, like those who sent me copies

of the New Testament show such lamentable ignorance about us Irish Catholics, how can we hope to be treated in a just and enlightened spirit by England? Is it any wonder that many of us are tempted to believe that a large portion of the people of that country shut their eyes and their ears to every explanation we give and every defence we make, preferring to remain in wilful ignorance about us, for some reason which the Author does not pretend to account for?

For nearly half a century the island of ACHILL occupied no inconsiderable place in the public mind, on account of the proselytizing onslaught made upon the faith of its inhabitants. The Protestant Mission was commenced there in 1834, by the Rev. Edward Nangle. A "Settlement," as it was called, was established on a farm of 130 acres for the staff of the Mission, and the Popish converts. The island is a short distance to the west of Mayo, between Blacksod bay and Clew bay, and is separated from the mainland by a narrow strip of sea called the Sound. It is 16 miles in length, and 7 in breadth, and about 80 miles in circumference; the whole comprising 46,401 statute acres, and containing, at the time Mr. Nangle's Mission began, 5,277 inhabitants. Whether wisely or not, Mr. Nangle attacked the doctrines of the Catholic Church in the most offensive way, grossly misrepresenting them, and then holding them up, so misrepresented, to contempt and ridicule. After some time he established a newspaper, by means of which, and by his letters to more influential journals, he managed to keep himself well before the public, both here and in England. His chief literary stock-in-trade consisted of denunciations of Popish superstition and idolatry, accounts of his efforts against the Romanists, and his great success in converting them; to complete the blessed work, no more was required than increased contributions. The full title of his newspaper was:—"The Achill Missionary Herald and Western Witness. A monthly journal exhibiting the principles and progress of Christ's Kingdom, and exposing the errors and abominations of that Section of the rival Kingdom of Antichrist, commonly called the Papacy." In the title pages of the different volumes, rude wood-cuts are inserted, the meaning of which is given on the back of the title. The illustration in the volume before me consists of two clumsy figures, said to have been worshipped by the Hindoos: between them is a full sized representation of a host, such as is usually prepared for consecration in the Sacrifice of the Mass. I refrain from quoting Mr. Nangle's full description of this picture; it is too gross and revolting; but its meaning is, that there is as much idolatry in worshipping what Mr. Nangle, with insulting blasphemy, calls

"the Wafer," as there is in worshipping the molten figures of the Hindoos.

Mr. Nangle was an educated man and a clergyman, and must have known that the real presence of our divine Lord in the Eucharist was a doctrine held for ages by the most enlightened nations of Europe, and by many of the most learned Protestants from the time of the Reformers. It ill became him, therefore, to place in the title page of his newspaper such an astounding picture, as the one above described. To have done so showed reliance on the ignorance of his readers.

There is difficulty in obtaining correct information about the proselytising missions in Ireland, the habit of exaggeration is so universal in every report one can procure. In a book entitled "Connemara Past and Present," published in 1853, by the Rev. J. Denham Smith, of Kingstown, it is stated that before the Famine, Achill had a population of 6,000, which was reduced by that terrible scourge to 4,000. He further says that "of all the poor inhabitants of the West of Ireland the very poorest were the people of Achill;"* and he adds that Protestants (all of whom were once Romanists) now number half the entire population [*i.e.* numbered 2,000], and that nearly *two* thousand of the young flood the several educational establishments [!!!] which lift up their heads over some 36,000 acres of land, a large proportion of which is springing into fine cultivation. A few lines earlier he said that 20 years before his visit the island was one vast tract of moorland, "yielding nothing but grouse and *fish*." Passing over the wonderful fact of fish growing on a moorland, it is evident from Mr. Smith's statistics that more than the young must have gone to school. If *nearly* two thousand, out of a population of *two* or even *four* thousand flooded the schools, young and old, man, woman, and child, must have gone to school; and if so who tilled the soil? Whose labour made the moorland of Achill smile with "fine cultivation?"

In 1852, Mr. Dallas announces Rev. Mr. Nangle's retirement from Achill, in the following words:—"After so many years of anxiety, and of continual opposition from the priests around him, Mr. Nangle's health had become unequal to the exertions by which this important mission had been planted and nurtured, and on which the blessing of God had so graciously descended. He therefore applied to the Society for Irish Church Missions, to undertake the superintendence of the work. Considerable difficulty attended this arrangement, as the rule of the Society forbade any mixture of temporal relief or secular assistance, and

* Pp. 119-20.

the direct missionary agency was the only branch that could be handed over to them. *Arrangements had to be made* for all the more secular institutions, and the spiritual work of the mission was then undertaken by the Committee of the Irish Church Missions.*

The Irish Church Mission people show great anxiety in their Reports, to impress us with their rule against using temporal means to gain converts.† The fact of Mr. Nangle having used such means created a great obstacle, Mr. Dallas tells us, to their taking up the Achill Mission from him. Hence, to get over the difficulty, "arrangements had to be made." What arrangements? Clearly, some other agency, besides that of the Church Missions, should be employed to give the same material aid to the converts, which Mr. Nangle had done before. If Catholics had used this kind of special pleading, it is more than probable that Mr. Dallas would denounce it as rank Jesuitism. What, in the name of common sense, did the converts care about the fine distinction of this agency or that? They received their clothes and rations as before for listening to the proselytisers. If they had not done this, they would have been deprived of both. What a charming loop-hole for the consciences of high-souled spiritual men, "who look above and beyond all human agencies; they are permitted to be fellow-workers with God."‡

I now proceed to give, on most reliable authority, the present state of the proselytizing Mission in Achill. "It is," says my informant, "to some small extent in existence, but what remains of it is amalgamated with and absorbed in the Irish Society, which, as is generally known, was established in 1818, for promoting the Scriptural Education and Religious Instruction of the Irish-speaking population, chiefly through the medium of their own language." Such is the title of the Society, but in giving it this title, its founders stated its real object very mildly indeed. It was and is, that Irish Catholics, residing in Irish-speaking parts of the country, might be proselytized and made Protestants by bible-readers who had acquired their language. My informant proceeds, "So, virtually, the Achill Mission, so far as conversions go, is a thing of the past. It has however, a good deal of this world's wealth, as two-thirds of the

* Story of the Irish Church Missions, p. 117.

† I have looked in vain for this rule in the published reports of the Society. In every printed report we find a series of eight rules called "The Constitution of the Society," and another series of seven called "The Object and Regulations of the Society," but in neither is there a word against giving material aid to converts.

‡ Report for 1885, p. 9.

Island is owned by the trustees of that Mission, for which for a considerable time they received from the Catholic people in rent, £1,800 a year, to be used, of course, in proselytizing themselves and their children. (!) Within the last two or three years, the Land Commissioners have reduced this large rental to £1,200 a year. This property was purchased for the Mission in 1852, principally through the Rev. Mr. Nangle, and mostly by English subscriptions."

The "quasi-converts, of whom Mr. Nangle boasted so much, have not remained with the proselytizers; their conversion was more apparent than real. They joined them to keep body and soul together—to keep themselves and their families from starvation,—and when better times came round, they returned to their former faith. This applies both to parents and children."

"Bribery, pure and simple, was the means adopted by Nangle and his agents, which took the shape of food, clothes, house and land—tempting advantages by which to seduce a *famine stricken* people."

"The parish of Achill, a good portion of which is on the mainland, has a population of about 7,500; of this total the Protestants number about 300, of whom 100 are coastguards, mostly English, who are frequently here to-day and away to-morrow. Another 50 are ex-coastguards who have settled down in the place, after having retired on pension; a doctor and his family, and a few other strangers; another 100 consists of the two Protestant ministers of the parish, Bible readers, ordinary teachers, Irish teachers, inspectors, &c. All those are strangers. Thus, deducting the 250 strangers above accounted for, there are about 50 natives of Achill in the Protestant Settlement, who are either Achill Soupers, or the children of Achill Soupers."

The idea in that part of the Province, near Achill, and in fact throughout a great part of it, is, that since the foundation of the mission in 1834—more than half a century ago,—sums that appear to outsiders quite fabulous, have been expended on it. We have been assured on most respectable authority, that the total outlay in Achill has reached the enormous figure of half a million sterling! It shakes one's credulity, but it is not at all the highest estimate that has reached the Author. One thing is clear, that a very large sum has been expended there. "It is said that Mr. Nangle frequently told his friends, that had it not been for the Famine of '47, his mission in Achill would have been a failure."

Those so-called Protestants of Achill are fast going into

Plymouthism—(*i.e.* becoming Plymouth Brethren) a sect known in Dublin and its vicinity, some years ago, as Darbyites, from the name of their founder, Mr. Darby, a Protestant clergyman.

THE IRISH CHURCH MISSIONS TO THE ROMAN CATHOLICS,
WITH BRIEF NOTICES OF SOME OTHER MISSIONS.

The Rev. Alex. Dallas was the founder of the Irish Church Missions to the Roman Catholics—a society founded in London in 1846. He was a retired soldier, having served under Wellington in the Peninsular war. In the beginning of "The Story of the Irish Church Missions," he says, that this was an admirable training to fit him for his future missionary career. There is no information given as to any other preparation for the work, but the reader is left to infer that he had an extraordinary call. The soldiering was, it is said, "the training of the natural man; but there was a deeper spiritual training needed, ere this vessel of mercy could be filled for the Maker's use, in the great work of these Missions. Under the hand of the Refiner, the spirit was to be chastened and moulded afresh for his service; and out of the lowest depths of self-abasement he was to have the call to a work, which in every step has magnified the Sovereign grace that had prepared the instrument." Whoever will seek, in the above mystifying passage, for any clue to the way in which the ex-Peninsular soldier was trained and educated for his Spiritual Mission, will seek in vain. He does not speak of study of any kind, so that his wish seems to be, that his readers would believe that, like St. Paul, he became a vessel of election in a moment, for his next words after the above quotation are—"Go in thy might, have the power of that commission."

Early in his Irish career, Mr. Dallas preached twenty-one sermons on the Second Advent in Cork, after which to rest and refresh himself, he went to Killarney. Sunday came, and he, of course, went to church. "The sermon pained him. It was a great mistake, from the text, 'If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments.' He longed, he tells us, to open the Gospel of Christ, and rectify the mistake. The mistake, Mr. Dallas leaves to infer, was in the sermon not in the text. But the preacher having chosen the above text we may well ask our readers, lay and clerical, what could he do but tell his congregation what our Divine Lord told the young man in the Gospel, that if they would enter into life they must keep the commandments? There is no other recommendation or comment whatever in it. Mr. Dallas, therefore, in undertaking to correct the preacher, corrects our Divine Lord himself. "He longed," he

says, "to open the Gospel of Christ, and rectify the mistake;" that is, he longed to open the Gospel of Christ to correct Christ himself! And he did. He managed to get into the pulpit at the evening service, where, to use his own words, "he laid open the Lord's way of enabling the sinner 'to enter into life,' and offered salvation to his hearers through faith in Christ Jesus." It is unpleasant to make use of the sacred name so often, but we are obliged to ask, did not Mr. Dallas offer salvation to the sinner through faith in the same Christ Jesus, who had said in the text of the morning sermon, "If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments"? Surely it would be impious to say that those words of our Lord exclude faith; so far from it, they suppose it. We are bound to love God above all things; but the proof of this love is the keeping of the commandments. "If you love me," says our Lord, "keep my commandments."—St. John xiv. 15. And the Apostle says, "Faith if it have not works is dead in itself." And again speaking more emphatically, "Wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?"* So much for reading the Bible without note, or comment, or guide; so much for the divine right of private judgment. Verily, Mr. Dallas, soldier and divine, you were a precious apostle for the conversion of benighted Papists in Ireland.

In 1852 Nassau William Senior was on a visit to the late Dr. Whately, Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, and in one of their conversations he asked his Grace, to what cause the numerous conversions to Protestantism then occurring were to be attributed. Among several causes the Archbishop said, that the explanation given by the Roman Catholics was, that the conversions were purchased. This Dr. Whately did not credit, but he related the following anecdote to Mr. Senior:—"An old woman went to one of my clergy and said, 'I am come to *surrender* to your Reverence—and I want the leg of mutton and the blanket.' 'What mutton and blanket?' said the clergyman. 'I have scarcely enough of either for myself and my family, and certainly none to give. Who could have put such nonsense into your head?' 'Why, sir,' she said, 'Father Sullivan told us, that the converts got each a leg of mutton and a blanket; and as I am famished and starving with cold, I thought that God would forgive me for getting them.'" He then adds that those who spread the calumny were challenged to prove it, but did not attempt to do so.†

* St. James Epist., chap. II.

† In these conversations Dr. Whately, who always posed as a Liberal, and was made Archbishop of Dublin by a Liberal Government, enunciates many most groundless charges against the priests with all the bitterness of a souper.

The reader will see the BRIBERY practised by the Society of Church Missions,

Having mentioned some other probable causes for the conversions of Catholics to Protestantism at that particular time (the time immediately succeeding the famine), Dr. Whately said, "The great instrument of conversion, however, is the diffusion of scriptural education."* The unlimited confidence which Protestants have always expressed in the universal diffusion of the Holy Scriptures, and the reading of them without note or comment by all classes, has been the puzzle and surprise of many. The Bible is not a book easily understood, even by well educated persons; if it were there need not have been such voluminous commentaries, Protestant and Catholic, upon it. The well-known Dr. Adam Clarke's commentary is a library in itself, which to all appearance, it would take the best part of a lifetime to read. And yet how can anyone deduce a religion from the Bible without mastering its contents? and how is that mastery to be attained? The most learned men—Episcopalians, Baptists, Anabaptists, Pedobaptists, and hundreds of others among the various grades of Dissenters, from Unitarians to Fifth Monarchy men, have asserted that they found their peculiar and widely different creeds in the inspired volume. Are they all in the right? They cannot be, for the Bible is the Word of God, and God is Truth and cannot contradict himself. Now if the learned differ about many of the most important portions of Holy Scripture, how could a Kings-court labourer or an Achill or Galway fisherman interpret it, and deduce the true body of Christian doctrine from it? and even if its meaning were as clear as noon-day, what is that to the illiterate peasant who cannot read, as numbers of the converts made by Protestant proselytizers in Ireland were unable to do?

The adversaries of the Catholic Church say it is founded on mere human authority—that of the priests. Surely the poor Souper proselytes can get no religion out of the Bible except by the aid of bible readers, who can scarcely be said to be much, if at all, their superiors in information; and yet they and their employers denounce all human authority in matters of religion. An illiterate convert therefore accepts the new religion on the worst kind of authority, that of ignorant bible readers. One of the oft repeated, well worn charges against Catholics is, that Popery and ignorance always went hand-in-hand; in fact, that Popery kept its ground by means of ignorance, and could not exist where enlightenment and education prevailed. But this theory was utterly destroyed when the Oxford movement became

brought out and exposed further on, in the notice of the correspondence between Rev. Mr. Webster, of Cork, and the heads of the Society.

* Senior, Vol. 2, p. 63

an undeniable fact. The greatest lights of England's greatest University failed to see Popery in the same light as that in which the proselytisers pretended to see it. How was this to be met? Most Rev. Dr. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, rose equal to the occasion, and in a Charge delivered about 1852 or 1853 undertook to prove that the Oxford conversions were no triumphs to the Catholic Church, because, says he, "*the conversion of a peasant who uses his reason, is a greater proof in favour of the truth of a religion, than that of a learned man, who lays aside reason, and follows his feelings and imagination.*"* It is pitiable to see a man like Dr. Whately, a distinguished scholar, a learned divine, and the author of a famous work on LOGIC, obliged, in his sore need, thus to beg the question in so evident a manner. What right had he to assume that the peasant, in the case, used his reason, and that the Oxford convert did not?

But it comes with a bad grace from the proselytizers to say, that the Catholic Religion thrives only where the people are ignorant, and that it sustains itself and prospers, by keeping them so. The charge applies with far greater force to the proselytizers themselves. Recall their principal Missionary efforts in Ireland, and you will find they have chosen for the scene of their labours the most illiterate and most destitute localities in the whole country; they were always ready to take advantage of any special visitation, such as the Cholera and the Famine. To begin with DINGLE, Mrs. Thompson, the historian of proselytism in that place, tells us that before the year of 1830, the country around Dingle had sunk into insignificance and poverty "until Dingle was only known as the name of a place *unknown*." In proof of this she appends a footnote, containing a common saying, in many parts of Ireland,—"*I wish you were in Dingle-y-Couch* ; being a cant phrase meaning totally out of the way."† But the terrible visitation of cholera reached Dingle in an aggravated form, and religious zeal, long dormant, according to Mrs. Thompson, sprung up in consequence. Lord Ventry appointed a Chaplain to himself at a salary of £150 a year—a chaplain he did not want, not being resident in Dingle at all; but the appointment was required for the work the cholera was expected to produce. Then there was the Rev. Mr. Goodman, curate of Dingle, and there was Mr. Gubbins, curate of some outlying parishes,‡ with scarcely

* The Author cannot lay his hand on the charge in question at present, but he made the above extract from it shortly after it was published.

† Introduction to Brief Account of Change of Religion, &c., &c., p. 4. By Mrs. D. P. Thompson.

‡ They were Ventry, Dunorlin, Keelmakedur and Kilquane. Dingle was attended to by Mr. Goodman.

a Protestant in any of them, except a few coastguards, who, it was Mrs. Thompson's hope, would form the nucleus of a future congregation. The three clergymen above named formed a missionary staff, and having no congregations of their own, they, in the most generous and disinterested way, declared that Catholics as well as Protestants were their parishioners.* A very convenient doctrine this was at a time when the people were in such dreadful straits, and when orphans were growing numerous with none to help them. Although Mrs. Thompson modestly passes over the fact, she had her hand in the work, for she established an orphanage for girls†—a kind and charitable thing in itself; but it meant proselytism, pure and simple; for Mrs. Thompson, judging from *her own book*, was one of the greatest proselytizers that ever crossed our path. Her husband was Lord Ventry's agent, and a J.P. moreover. He and Mrs. Thompson occupied the mansion of the absent Lord Ventry, whence they ruled with absolute sway. The Catholics were prostrate before them, whilst the soupers basked in their smiles, and were rampant on account of their support.‡ I saw, many years ago, what I was assured was an exact copy of the subscriptions to the Dingle Soupers. I would not now venture to indicate the sum total, but it was very large. Rev. Mr. Gayer, Lord Ventry's chaplain, made a collection through England. A Miss Mahon took up the work of collecting subscriptions for the founding of a "Dingle Colony." Before the end of 1840 she was enabled to place in the hands of trustees money sufficient to build fifteen cottages. They were proceeded with, but not quite finished, when Mr. Monck Mason (as sound a Protestant as ever breathed) wrote a letter in the *Christian Examiner*, condemning the rewarding of converts in the manner projected by Miss Mahon. This he did on three grounds—1. the expense, which was calculated to drain resources hitherto flowing into the Irish Society; 2. 'the embarrassment—becoming daily more inconvenient—arising from *new* objects being proposed to the public of Great Britain demanding their bounty for the same ends;' and 3. that there was no warrant in Scripture for any such mode of rescuing converts from the persecution, which was the predicted result of their conversion, and the bearing of which persecution was the truest test of their sincerity. Rev. Mr. Gayer, Lord Ventry's chaplain, responded in

* Brief Account, &c., p. 10.

† Lewis's Top. Dictionary of Ireland. Art. Dingle.

‡ It was in Dingle the proselytizers and the converts were first called Soupers. This sobriquet was given to them by Rev. John (afterwards Archdeacon) O'Sullivan, then stationed there.

a lengthy letter which does not seem to have been a satisfactory reply to Mr. Monck Mason. His reply to Mr. Mason's third objection is, that no convert gets the cottage and the bit of ground until they are well tried, and that these temporal advantages are not held out as inducements to Catholics to become Protestants. This reasoning seems very inconclusive; for when poor starving Catholics see that people who were as poor as themselves become possessed of snug cottages with ground attached to each, merely because they become Protestants, the conclusion is easily arrived at, that they will, within a limited time, get the same for leaving the old and joining the new religion. The trial of their sincerity, Mr. Gayer admits, is sometimes but two years, and occasionally even less.*

Mrs. Thompson, of course, had a word to say on the subject. She says: "We feel that it is hard (indeed almost impossible) for those not actually engaged in a work of this kind in Ireland, to understand fully the necessity for the temporal relief to converts from Popery. One thing is certain that no one ever condemned it but those who were never practically engaged in a similar work, and it is equally certain, that all the Lord's servants engaged in Missionary enterprise, whether at home or abroad, among Heathens, Jews, Turks or Heretics, are obliged to attend to their temporal wants also. The Apostles and Primitive Church did so, and those who entrust to us money for the Lord's work here, are willing we should do likewise."† This passage opens the way to much controversy, which we have no intention to enter upon. It may, however, be remarked that Mr. Dallas, and the Irish Church Missions' people held in theory at least, that no *material* aid should be given to converts, and that it was never given by them.‡

A book entitled "Memorandums made in Ireland in the Autumn of 1852," throws considerable light on the working of the Irish Church Missions at that period.§ Like every other honest inquirer after truth, he found it impossible to get any reliable statistics as to the actual number of conversions from Catholicity to Protestantism. He says: "I cannot obtain from the

* Letter in Brief Account, &c., p. 120. Mr. Mason compiled a valuable History of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin.

† Brief Account, &c., p. 221.

‡ But see the quotations which follow immediately, from Dr. Forbes' book and the correspondence between Mr. Eade and Mr. Webster, Chancellor of Cork.

§ Memorandums made in Ireland in the Autumn of 1852, by John Forbes, M.D. F.R.S., Hon. D.C.L. Oxon., Physician to her Majesty's Household. Dr. Forbes was afterward knighted by the Queen.

publications of the society any positive statistics as to the amount of conversions from Catholicism effected by it, beyond what is supplied by the following statements, taken from one of the publications, of date, November, 1852:—‘The Bishop of Tuam, in October, 1849, confirmed 401 converts; in September, 1851, he confirmed 712 converts; in July and August, 1852, he confirmed 535 converts, making a total of 1648. . . . In the district of West Galway, there are now between 5,000 and 6,000 converts in connection with this Society. . . . Nearly 5,000 children of converts or Romanists daily attend the Scriptural Schools of the Society.’”

“Although well aware, as already remarked, of the great conversion movement in this part of Ireland, and consequently not disposed to overlook a matter so interesting and important, it is nevertheless true, that its existence would have been hardly revealed to me by anything that fell under my own immediate observation as I passed through the country. Everything that I saw and heard indicated the presence of the same Catholic people, and the same Catholic institutions which I had seen hitherto in every district, town, and village, visited by me in Ireland. I saw and heard very little more of Protestants or Protestantism than elsewhere, except I made special inquiries of those specially interested in the question. This struck me the more forcibly from the fact of my being previously acquainted with the statistical statements given above, and because I had read, in one of the publications of the Society, the following announcement:—*‘The Society’s missions in West Galway, have been the means of rendering a district, extending fifty miles in breadth, characteristically Protestant, which but a few years ago was characteristically Romish.’*”

“Without attempting to call in question the accuracy of the statistics given by the Society, as quoted above,—though all statisticians know the danger of dealing with *round numbers*—I must take the liberty of saying, that the statement just quoted in Italics must be regarded rather as the expression of an amiable and sanguine enthusiasm, commingling the hopes of the future with the over-appreciation of the present, than as the sober definition of a reality. Even if the statistics were rigidly accurate, and we were to take for granted that the number of actual converts was 5,000 or 6,000, how could we distribute such a small number as this over a space of fifty miles, so as to give the district the character attributed to it in our Italics? or how could we reconcile this statement with the actual population of the district? I do not know how large a portion of the county of Galway may be comprehended in the fifty miles mentioned, but it must be a considerable portion; as I see by the Gazetteer that

its greatest length is only eighty miles; its greatest breadth forty-two and a half; and its smallest breadth thirteen and a half; while by the last census it shows a population of no less than 298,564. The statement seems equally at variance with what I have just noticed as the general aspect hitherto presented to us by the people of the country, and seems in no way borne out by our subsequent experience.”*

“I visited two of the Protestant Missions Schools at Clifden, one in the town, and the other about a mile and a half beyond, on the road leading to the mouth of the bay. In the former, at the time of my visit, there were about 120 boys and 100 girls on the books, the average attendance being about 80. Out of the 80 girls there were no less than 56 orphans, all of whom are fed and clothed *out of the school funds*, and a large proportion provided with lodgings also.”†

“At the probationary girls’ school there were 76 on the books at the time of my visit, their ages varying from eight to eighteen years. They were all Catholics or children of Catholic parents; and out of the number no fewer than 40 are orphans. All the children of this school receive daily rations of Indian meal; 45 of them 1 lb., and the remainder, half that quantity. Whether this is exclusive of the stirabout breakfast I saw preparing for them in the school I forgot to ask. All the children of these schools read the Scriptures and go to the Protestant Church, Catholic and Protestant alike.”‡

A notice of the SOCIETY FOR IRISH CHURCH MISSIONS TO THE ROMAN CATHOLICS would be incomplete without some account of a correspondence which took place eleven or twelve years after Dr. Forbes’s visit to Clifden, and which arose out of a sermon preached by the Rev. George Webster, A.M., Chancellor of Cork, in December, 1863. In it he accused the Society of bribing their supposed converts. On hearing this the Rev. H. C. Eade, the Secretary of the Society, wrote to the Rev. Mr. Webster, asking

* Memorandums made in Ireland, &c., Vol. I., pp. 244, 246, 247.

† The phrase “out of the school funds” was, of course, put in to keep up the delusion, that the Irish Church Mission to the Roman Catholics indignantly repel the charge of attending to anything but the spiritual good of their converts. So the 100 poor girls, all paupers, 56 of them being orphans, were able to pay such school fees as fed and clothed themselves, and provided a large proportion of them with lodgings! I wonder that those excellent Missionaries who told Dr. Forbes such a glaring falsehood, did not see that it carried its own refutation with it.

‡ Memorandums, &c., p. 247. The girls in the probationary school being old Catholics, evidently went for the meal and stirabout, which was given them in the hope of converting them by degrees.

if "he had made the charge, and if so, on what grounds." To this letter Mr. Webster sent a curt reply as follows:—"May I beg leave to ask what do you and the Irish Church Mission Society mean by bribery?" In answer to this inquiry Rev. Mr. Eade says that "to give money or anything else to Roman Catholics on the condition of their *declaring themselves Protestants* would be bribery."* Mr. Webster accepts the definition so far as it goes, but being of opinion that it did not cover the whole ground, he adds:—"I believe bribery may refer to more than this. Any man may be fairly charged with bribery, who gives money or any temporal assistance to his fellow-creatures for doing anything which that fellow-creature believes to be wrong. With this kind of bribery I did charge the Irish Church Missions Society last Wednesday week, and I make the same charge on every occasion in public or private, whenever the subject is naturally introduced to my notice. I see no reason still for withdrawing the charge."†

"You have schools to which Roman Catholics send their children to be taught Protestantism, and the parents of these children are influenced to do this by the food and clothes given in your schools. The money to buy this assistance may be collected locally in the various districts where the schools are situate, and the money collected in England may be devoted to the payment of agents and 'Missionaries;' but still the money for food is collected under the auspices of the Society, and with its full sanction. If the food and clothes are not given to tempt the children and adults to attend the classes in the schools, but given as mere charity, why is the food not given to those who refuse to attend the classes? If Archbishop Cullen could afford to open good boarding schools for the poor Roman Catholics in Dublin,

* "The publication of this remarkable correspondence in its complete form, has been rendered necessary by the appearance of a pamphlet, issued by the *Irish Church Missions' Society*, in which sundry letters from the Revs. G. Webster, and H. C. Eade, and A. R. C. Dallas to the Editor of the *Cork Constitution*, are not published. It was felt by many a *desideratum* to have the whole correspondence, especially as so many writers in the Provincial Papers of England and Ireland had fallen into the very natural mistake of supposing that the pamphlet which has already appeared was complete. It seems from one of Mr. Webster's statements [see letter dated 15th February] that his reply to one of Mr. Eade's letters, although published the very day after Mr. Eade's publications, was wilfully omitted by the *Irish Church Missions' Society* in their pamphlet."—*Opening paragraph of Preface to the Compendium: by the Editors.*

The only complete copy of the correspondence between Rev. G. Webster, M.A., Chancellor of Cork, and the Revs. H. C. Eade, and A. R. C. Dallas, relating to the charge of BRIBERY against THE SOCIETY FOR IRISH CHURCH MISSIONS, together with a paper on Conscience by the Rev. A. R. C. Dallas, and Mr. Colquhoun's letter to the *Daily Telegraph*. Edited by Four Rectors. Dublin: Hodges, Smith and Co., 1864.

† Letter IV., p. 17.

would he not at once fill these schools with Roman Catholic children, and empty the poorhouses. What, then, is keeping the thousands of children away, who refuse to enter your schools, and whose parents are willing to let them put up with the wretchedness of the poorhouse? There can, I think, be but one answer to this question, and that is *the moral sense of right and wrong*, such as it is, in these parents, direct this part of their conduct. If you, then, offer such parents worldly inducements, *with the intention* of tempting them to send their children to you, I believe your Society is fairly chargeable with *bribery*. All this I explained to my congregation."

"Your obedient servant,

"GEORGE WEBSTER."

"Rev. H. C. Eade."

The question under discussion was a very simple one, but in his next letter Mr. Eade feels it convenient or politic to complicate it by introducing extraneous matters; so he goes into an explanation of "the many different means" which the Society employed in carrying out its work. Having exhausted these, he is at last obliged to face the real point, and is driven to make the following (to him) very inconvenient admission: addressing Mr. Webster, he says,—"*You say that there is bribery in them [the Society's schools], because food is often given to the children in attendance. Before making this charge, it would have been well to have been fully acquainted with the facts of the case. It is quite true that in some, but by no means all of the Mission Schools, food in the form of breakfast is provided, not by the Mission funds, but by money* collected by local friends for the purpose.* It must be borne in mind that the food to which we are referring is never offered on any condition of the children becoming Protestants."

At the close of his letter Rev. Mr. Eade writes: "As your charge was made publicly in a sermon before a congregation in the city of Cork, I am sure you will perceive that I am at liberty to make this correspondence public through the medium of the Press."†

* "The reader will observe this nice distinction."—Eds. The italics are the Author's. The passage lets in the light on Mr. Dallas's difficulty in taking charge of the Achill Mission, &c., &c.

† "But it is offered on condition that the children attend the religious instruction of Protestant teachers."—Eds. Letter V., pp. 19, 20.

‡ P. 23. "It will be observed it was Mr. Eade who first published this correspondence."—Eds.

To this Mr. Webster replies: "I cannot, of course, have the least objection to your giving any publicity, you may think desirable, to this correspondence; and I am obliged to you for the trouble you have taken to convince me that the charge of bribery cannot be justly laid at the doors of the Irish Church Missions. I regret, however, that in your letter you did not confine yourself more to the one point I endeavoured to press upon your notice, and that is, that temporal relief is given undoubtedly to Roman Catholics, children and adults, on the express condition, not that they will profess themselves Protestants, but that they will attend your classes and listen to peculiarly Protestant teaching. I complain, not that temporal relief is given to our starving fellow-creatures, but that it is given on condition that they commit sin. You do not deny that if the relief be given to induce them to do what they believe to be wrong, the Roman Catholic commits sin who violates his conscience, and you sin doubly in offering the worldly inducement for such a purpose."

"You say, 'even if under the teaching of Rome some of them believed *at first*, that they were doing wrong, they soon discover,' &c. This is just the point I wish to dwell upon. I cannot say what good results may spring from evil, but I cannot believe that any results, however beneficial, could justify me in using unlawful means. You must acknowledge that the bread and clothes are given to the children and to the adults for the very purpose of bringing them to your schools."

"Again you say that the Roman Catholic children in Dublin who attend your schools, 'could obtain greater temporal advantages in Roman Catholic schools or dormitories in the same locality.' Probably you are not aware that the miserable relief that the Roman Catholics are endeavouring to give, has been very laudably provided by them, for the purpose of counteracting the system of temptation which *The Irish Church Missions' Society* has instituted. You cannot surely mean to say that Archbishop Cullen is able to collect as much money in Dublin, for the temporal relief of the countless thousands of Roman Catholics who are willing to receive it, as *The Irish Church Missions' Society* collects in all Ireland! At all events as a Protestant, I should feel ashamed to enter into such a contest with any body of men. It appears to me to be wholly unworthy of Protestantism to make the poverty of Roman Catholics an occasion of out-bidding, or over-reaching the Heads of the Roman Catholic Church, and therefore, as long as you tempt Roman Catholics, by a regular fixed system of relief, to prefer the interests of this world to the interests of the world to come,

so long I must feel bound to make every protest in my power against the Irish Church Missions Society.*

"If it were necessary, I could give instances where the ordained agents of the Irish Church Missions paid Protestants to pretend they were Roman Catholics at your controversial meeting, and at these meetings to call these very ordained agents the hardest names. I could tell you of a school, of which it was reported that there were eighty Roman Catholics in attendance, when the fact was, not a single Roman Catholic ever entered the school, except some five or six wretched children, who were sent from Dublin by *The Irish Church Missions' Society*. I could tell you of a scene I once witnessed at the same establishment, where, on a Sunday morning, large quantities of bread were given to Roman Catholics for learning a verse of Holy Scripture, and where these same people went away cursing the Protestants, and cursing the very persons who gave them the bread, and taught them the verse. I could tell you of agents who were known to be charged with drunkenness and other vices, who entered in their Reports that they were persecuted, when they merely got into broils by their drunkenness, and who were, in spite of the remonstrance of the parish clergyman, retained in their offices. I could tell you of a Report made by one ordained agent, that he had made fourteen converts from Romanism in a certain locality, and who had to acknowledge, when I inquired closely into the matter, that these fourteen persons did not belong at all to that locality,—that they had been brought there by this agent himself from distant places, and lodged in a schoolhouse, and there represented as converts from the locality where they had been supported for a few weeks. These and many other facts I could repeat, and there are multitudes of clergymen in Ireland who are able to bear a similar testimony from their own experience; but I should prefer to confine our present controversy to the one grand object—the charge of, what I must call, bribery."† . . .

I am quite sure that multitudes of the supporters of the Society in England would never give their money for the purpose of bribery; and it may be for this reason that the Society is so careful to inform the English people, that all the money collected in England is devoted to the "*missionary*" part of the work. Be this as it may, it is a remarkable fact that the Society loses no opportunity of declaring that "not one shilling of the money collected in England is devoted to the purchase of food or clothes;" and I think it ought always to be added that nearly

* Letter VI., p. 25.

† Ibid., pp. 25, 26.

all the money collected in Ireland is devoted to this purpose. . . .
 "The terrible fact with which you have to grapple is, that under your Society a Roman Catholic child receives his bed and breakfast—he is housed and clothed—on the expressed condition that he listens to Protestant teaching and attends a Protestant place of worship."*

The giving of temporal relief to Roman Catholics to accept Protestant teaching and attend Protestant worship, having been fully proved by Mr. Webster and admitted, although reluctantly, by Mr. Eade, the latter takes up the question of conscience, which Mr. Webster had been pressing upon him from the beginning. He faces it at last, and differs with Mr. Webster's theory concerning it, saying:—"Allow me to remind you that the conscience of a Roman Catholic is a misdirected conscience. . . . Such being the case, no Roman Catholic can even *take the first step* out of such a system without violating his misdirected conscience." Of this argument the Editors say in a note: "Mr. Eade forgets that the sin of which Mr. Webster spoke was the sin of those Roman Catholic parents, who, *for the sake of food and clothes*, were willing to endanger (as they believed) the everlasting salvation of their children."† It may be added, that Mr. Eade's argument about conscience, besides being utterly untrue in itself, is founded on his belief that the Catholic Church is a false Church, and that the Protestant Church is the true one. To assume this is very cool of Mr. Eade. In doing so, he undertakes, by a very short process, to put an end to that religious controversy which has exercised the greatest intellects at both sides, since the days of the Protestant Reformation; and to say the least of it, no one, as far as we know, except Mr. Eade, has assumed that the controversy is closed, and by the decision of Christendom closed against the claims of the Catholic Church! Mr. Eade's notion of an erroneous conscience is, that those who believe in a Church in which he does not believe, have a "mis-directed," or erroneous conscience, which he is quite justified in setting right, thought his may not be accomplished "without violating his misdirected conscience." We wonder he did not see

* The charge of temporal relief to Roman Catholics for listening to Protestant teaching is thus replied to by Mr. Eade:—"No funds of the Society, whether collected in Ireland or England, are ever expended in temporal relief."—Letter VII., p. 30. To this assertion the Editors append the following note:—"Mark the peculiar emphasis to be laid on SOCIETY." The money, as already admitted, was obtained by other agencies, and it is sorry special pleading to say the SOCIETY was not accountable for it; it was cognizant of it, as Mr. Eade had already admitted, and thankful for it.—See Letter V., p. 19, and Letter IX., p. 35, for a repetition of same.

† Note to Letter VII., p. 29.

that the argument tells both ways. Surely a Catholic can retort, without at all adopting his indefensible theory of conscience-curing, and tell him that he, Mr. Eade, belongs to a false, heretical Church, and therefore has a "misdirected" conscience; and that he, the said Catholic, will set him right by referring him to an infallible Church, which is the supreme judge of religious controversies, and which will supply him with a true, rightly directed conscience, instead of the "misdirected" one which he has at present.

The question of Conscience having become an important factor in the controversy, Mr. Dallas impetuously rushed to the assistance of Mr. Eade, and published a lengthy paper which he called "Conscience," addressed to no one in particular. On this strange production we will express no opinion. The Editors of the Correspondence introduce it with this remark:—"We think it desirable to publish a paper issued by Mr. Dallas (if it be not a mere squib or forgery) on the subject of Conscience." (!) It was nothing of the kind; it was an Essay on Conscience, of which the Author evidently had a very high opinion. He says at the very opening of it,—"In the course of the correspondence [Mr. Webster and Mr. Eade] the *Websterian dogma* concerning Conscience has been shown to be erroneous." This observation the Editors mildly but effectively rebuke, in the following words:—"We do not know why Mr. Dallas should call Mr. Webster's teaching 'the Websterian dogma.' It is the dogma of Bishop Butler, and of all the great moralists that ever wrote on the subject, to say nothing of its being the direct teaching of the Apostle Paul."* Mr. Dallas refers to St. Peter's vision as related in the Acts of the Apostles (chap. x.) where the account is given of a certain vessel descending, wherein were "all manner of four-footed beasts, and creeping things of the earth and fowls of the air." A voice from heaven said to Peter, "Arise and eat," &c., but Peter constrained by his conscience refused to do so. Mr. Dallas applies this act of St. Peter's to his own view of "Conscience," and says in his opinion it is more applicable to the subject of conscience than Mr. Webster's illustration. The following is the commentary of the Editors upon this assertion of Mr. Dallas: "If we had not seen this passage in print, we could not have believed upon a mere report that any clergyman ever wrote it. Surely Mr. Dallas, upon reconsidering it, must see that the moment St. Peter was fully satisfied in his own mind, that it was the voice of God he was listening to, his conscience must have prompted him at once to obey that voice.

* Correspondence, p. 48, note, by Editors.

His obedience then was not against his conscience, but entirely in accordance with it. Does Mr. Dallas really think St. Peter believed he was committing sin, when 'not being doubting' (Acts x. 12), 'fully persuaded to his own mind,' he obeyed what he believed the commandment of God."*

What an opinion the four Rectors, who edited the Correspondence, must have had of Mr. Dallas, the man who had constituted himself the Modern Apostle of Ireland!

The very grave charge made by Mr. Webster against the *Society*, at p. 25, beginning, "If it were necessary I could give instances," &c., was taken up by Mr. Eade after he had said his last word on the question of "Conscience." He deals with it as follows:—"A third point in your letter is calculated to deceive those who might hear a charge, but who might not be in a position to investigate its truth. 'Ordained agents of the Irish Church Missions,' you say, 'paid Protestants to pretend they were Roman Catholics, and speak at the controversial meetings,' &c. This miserable charge was brought forward some years ago by Dr. Cullen in one of his pastorals, without, however, any mention of the names of the persons accused, and though the charge was indignantly repudiated at the time by all the clergy connected with our Mission, and, let me add, by some Roman Catholics themselves, who had spoken at the classes, it has been from time to time repeated, and as often denied."† In his letter of reply Mr. Webster writes:—"I never *denied* that it was the duty of a Protestant, on all suitable occasions, to endeavour to show a Roman Catholic that he is bound to 'search the scriptures,' and exercise his mind and reason to discover the truth. Therefore all you say on this subject has, I submit, nothing to do with the question between us."‡ "All the facts I mentioned about 'ordained agents,' who paid Protestants *to act the part* of Roman Catholics at your controversial meetings, &c., are facts to which I can testify from my own actual knowledge; and if necessary, I can give names and dates to verify all I have said."§

In his next letter Rev. Mr. Eade says:—"I not only 'do not deny,' but I feel deeply thankful that Christian friends are found

* Correspondence, p. 53, *note*. "What would the Apostle have said if one of the Christians in Corinth who had 'knowledge' offered *money* to one of his weak brethren to induce him to defile his conscience! Let it never be forgotten that the whole question is about the offer of money, or food, or clothes, to induce the violation of conscience."—Editors' Preface, p. 13.

† Letter VII., p. 31.

‡ Letter VIII., p. 33.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

to collect money for the temporal support of the ragged schools and dormitories, and I heartily wish they had more funds at their disposal.”* “With regard to the names of the ‘ordained agents,’ who, as you allege, paid Protestants to speak at classes and pretend they were Roman Catholics, I am willing to leave it to your judgment as to whether they should be brought forward, merely saying, that I presume they are persons either now connected with the Society, or within reach, so that they can answer for themselves on so grave a charge. For myself, I am quite content with again declaring, that the Society neither practises nor sanctions such proceedings, and I have no doubt that you have been misinformed.”†

It is known already to the reader that it was Mr. Eade who first published the correspondence with Mr. Webster. His object in doing so is clear enough; he wished to forestall the latter with English readers, English newspapers, and above all with the English subscribers to the Society. It was this piece of cleverness which evidently influenced the four editors to publish the full correspondence, although Mr. Webster does not appear to have ambitioned publication in the permanent form of a pamphlet.‡

After the correspondence had apparently closed, a series of letters in continuation of it were published in the *Cork Constitution*. As these are quite as important as any that have been yet noticed, they cannot be passed over in silence here. They are published by the Editors in an Appendix. The first letter in the Appendix is from Rev. Mr. Eade. Writing to the editor of the *Constitution* he says:—“With reference to your leading article of yesterday on my correspondence with Mr. Webster, I beg to state that I have no objection whatever to the production of the names of the ‘clerical agents’ of the Irish Church Missions, who are alleged to have acted the unworthy part imputed to them, and this I fully stated in my letter from which you quoted.”§ Mr. Webster’s reply is clear and direct. It is:—“All that I have to say in reply to a letter from Mr. Eade, which appears in this morning’s *Constitution*, is, the scenes I have described in my correspondence with Mr. Eade were witnessed by myself in Irishtown school-house, Dublin, in 1856, and I complained of them at the time to my Rector, and

* Letter IX., p. 35. The Italics are the Author’s.

† Ibid.

‡ See reason given by Eds. in Preface to Correspondence, p. 3, for publishing the full correspondence.

§ Appendix, Letter I., p. 56.

to the Archbishop of Dublin. The Archbishop held an inquiry into the whole matter in October, 1857, and the result of the inquiry was, the Irish Church Missions were removed by the order of the Rector from Irishtown. - Of all this Mr. Eade, Mr. Dallas, and all the other leading agents of the Irish Church Missions are fully aware; and besides this, all the charges against the Society which appear in my letters to Mr. Eade are only a repetition of what I said in Cork five years ago, at a large clerical meeting, in the presence of the same Mr. Eade. If any person is disposed to blame me for the scandal of disclosing these things by means of the public Press, I have merely to add, that *the correspondence was published by Mr. Eade, and not by me.* I have never made any secret of my opposition to the Irish Church Missions; I have always endeavoured, however, to correct the fearful evils of its system, by first making my complaints, either at head-quarters or in the presence of the clergy. . . .

"The scenes I described are similar to all the scenes which may be witnessed any day in the year, in any place where the Irish Church Missions Society gives bread and clothes to Roman Catholics for doing what they believe to be sinful; and therefore, the *real* question between Mr. Eade and all the opponents of the Irish Church Missions is—Are we justified in giving food and clothes to our fellow-creatures, for the purpose of tempting them to do what they believe to be displeasing to their Heavenly Father? Are we justified in doing evil that good may come? Are we justified in systematically teaching people to prefer the interests of this world to the interests of the world to come? This I submit is the grand point at issue; and Mr. Eade has now acknowledged (what many clergymen in Ireland knew before)* that there is a fund, which is collected in Ireland under the auspices of the Irish Church Missions Society, and with its full sanction and approval, by which fund the most objectionable part of the machinery of the Society has been worked. It is to the existence of this 'secret service' fund that I object; and I am altogether at a loss to know how the agents of the Society, who know of the existence of that fund, are able so confidently to tell our English brethren this, 'not one shilling of the funds of the Society are expended in temporal relief.' I do not say that there are not many other parts of the machinery of the Society to which I object, such as the exceedingly rash and irreverent advertisements that appear

* "Many clergy in Ireland no doubt knew this, but it is evident our English brethren were not so well informed."—EDS.

in the Dublin newspapers almost every day, for the supposed instruction of Roman Catholics; but these are comparatively trifling details, and I should willingly enter into a discussion about *them*, and sundry such matters, were I not, as I have said, unwilling to allow attention to be withdrawn for one moment from what I believe to be positively *immoral* and *unholy* in the system. 'To him who esteemeth anything to be unclean to him it is unclean.' It is upon this one point the whole question we are now discussing with the Irish Church Mission depends, and it appears to me that if you once admit that 'the end justifies the means,' there is no act of injustice, fraud, treachery, or oppression that may not be employed in the service of religion or civilization."*

From the time Mr. Webster charged the Irish Church Missions with paying Protestants to pretend they were Roman Catholics at the controversial meetings of the Society, in order to defend Catholic doctrines there, and in due time to confess they were worsted in the contest, Mr. Eade had in his letters been calling on Mr. Webster to name the "ordained agents" who had acted such an unworthy part. This Mr. Webster undertook to do, if guaranteed against legal proceedings, but the guarantee was never offered. And because Mr. Webster refused to give publicity to the names in the absence of such guarantees, Mr. Eade triumphs over him, saying that "he would have been more conscientious if he had not made a charge public before he was prepared to give publicly a proof of its being true."†

But we must hasten to conclude this account of the "Irish Church Missions to Roman Catholics." The question of paying Protestants to pretend they were Catholics came before the Archbishop of Dublin (Dr. Whately), with other grave charges against the Society, and he held an inquiry on the subject, of which Mr. Webster publishes an account, written by a clergyman who was present; Mr. Webster himself was not there, as he was one of the accusing parties. In the second place, Mr. Webster publishes a letter written to Mr. Dallas by the Archbishop, which he had

* Letter No. II., Appendix, pp. 57, 58, 59.

† "Mr. Eade forgets that Mr. Webster offers the names if guaranteed against legal consequences. . . . Let the offer be accepted, or let the names be given *privately* to Mr. Eade, and let that gentleman either acknowledge that the promise has been redeemed or give a reason for maintaining that it has not."—*Ed. of the Cork Constitution. Correspondence, &c., p. 73.*

With what necessary caution Mr. Webster acted is proved by the following extract from the investigation before Most Rev. Dr. Whately:—"Then came M——— (a most respectable parishioner of Donnybrook). Mr. Dallas cautioned him, as an action for libel might be the result of some of his statements !!!" *Notes of Investigation in Correspondence, p. 91.*

called on Mr. Dallas to publish ; that gentleman, however, replied that he was unable to publish the letter *at present*, and “had forgotten all about it.” Mr. Webster being in possession of a copy of the letter, prints it with the notes taken at the investigation, not by himself, but by another clergyman who gave them to him.

He proceeds:—

“After these two important documents, I think it desirable to repeat some of the statements made by Mr. Eade and Mr. Dallas in their published letters, so that the public may be able to judge how the matter now stands.”

“‘These particular charges,’ Mr. Eade says, ‘were never investigated before the late Archbishop of Dublin, as Mr. Dallas, who was present, will testify ; and neither I nor any other officer of the Society know of any one who was ever guilty of the conduct described, and which is, in fact, virtually imputed to our whole body. The details of the specific charges made by Mr. Webster, I, for example, never knew till I read them in this correspondence ; *nor do I know of any one who ever had an opportunity of replying to such accusations.*’ Yet it is now seen from the Archbishop’s letter that Mr. Eade wrote the very letter to which his Grace makes so many allusions. Mr. Dallas says, ‘Mr. Webster’s inference that the charges were known to the Society is entirely unjustifiable, and proves no such thing ; but shows that Mr. Webster’s statement about the inquiry was *utterly untrue.*’ (I confess I do not understand the meaning of this sentence).* ‘It would seem that Mr. Webster’s object is to *misguide* the readers of this correspondence, by suggesting illogical inferences, directing the mind from the true points at issue. *I, personally for myself, and officially for the Society, distinctly deny every one of Mr. Webster’s charges as criminating the Society in any particular. My distinct statement is directly opposed to Mr. Webster’s.* I am quite satisfied to leave the choice of credit upon the readers of the correspondence.’ ‘*Not one of these “scenes” described by Mr. Webster in his correspondence formed the subject of the inquiry to which Mr. Webster alludes.*’ What then are my charges which Mr. Dallas so emphatically denies ?

“1. That food and clothes are given to poor Roman Catholics in Ireland by the Irish Church Missions Society, to induce these Roman Catholics to do what they believe to be sinful ?

*“Mr. Webster says he does not understand what could possibly be the meaning of this sentence ; we think we might safely offer a large reward to any one who could explain it. Eds.” Note to Mr. Dallas’s letter in which the passage occurs.

"Does Mr. Dallas deny this ?

"2. That several years ago I made charges against the Society precisely the same as the charges repeated in my correspondence with Mr. Eade, and that these charges were well known to the Society, and especially to Mr. Dallas himself and to Mr. Eade.

"Does Mr. Dallas now deny this ?

"3. That these charges were made by me against the Society, at an inquiry held by the late Archbishop of Dublin, into the operations of the Society in Donnybrook parish.

"Does Mr. Dallas now deny this ?

"4. That after this investigation, the Archbishop gave a judgment condemnatory of the Society's operations in that locality.

"Does Mr. Dallas now deny this ?

"5. That at this investigation the definite charge made by me (not the one alluded to in the Archbishop's letter) against one ordained agent for paying a man who acted the part of a Roman Catholic, was supported by the testimony of at least one respectable parishioner of Donnybrook—one who actually saw the ordained agent giving the money.

"Does Mr. Dallas now deny this ?

"6. (I pass this paragraph as it refers to the bishop and clergy of Limerick, and does not immediately affect the issue here).

"7. That it is always reported in England by the Society that not one shilling of the Funds of the *Society* is given for temporal relief in Ireland, and yet that several thousands of pounds are raised in Ireland to provide food and clothes and lodging for the *converts** (?) with the full sanction of the Society itself.

"Does Mr. Dallas deny this ?

"8. That this fund for temporal relief is part of the accredited machinery of the Society, and that to the present hour the temporal relief is given upon the expressed condition that the recipients attend the controversial classes.

"Does Mr. Dallas deny this ?

"These are eight definite charges which I make against the Society, and I shall now leave my readers to judge how far these charges have been justified by me. If any more documentary evidence relating to the investigation held by the late Archbishop be required, I shall be able very easily to provide it. But I submit I have now given proof that his Grace and Mr. Dallas were well aware of what Mr. Dallas must now have totally forgotten. I will not charge Mr. Dallas, as he has charged me, with direct falsehood, for I am willing to put the most charitable con-

* This is Mr. Webster's note of interrogation, not the Author's.

struction possible upon his very serious mistake. I cannot believe that Mr. Dallas could have remembered the correspondence between himself and his Grace, and of which the Archbishop's letter, now published, formed a part; and yet I can hardly acquit Mr. Dallas of some rashness in so hastily impugning the veracity of a brother clergyman."*

To the above formidable array of charges, reproduced from the body of the correspondence, we might fairly look for something from Mr. Dallas that could be called a rejoinder. But no. After its appearance he prints two short letters: the first merely says that "the existence" of the Archbishop's letter "had gone from his memory;" yet when he had a search made the letter was found, and he sent a copy of it to the *Cork Constitution*, but it had just appeared in that Journal a day or two before from Mr. Webster. In his second letter Mr. Dallas has nothing to say about the charges made by Mr. Webster, but that, "*to a fair judging mind it will easily appear that in all he [Mr. Webster] says, nothing is inconsistent with the account which he [Mr. Dallas] had given from memory of what occurred at the investigation before the Archbishop of Dublin in 1857.*"† As to the eight charges," he proceeds, "I have only to repeat my denial in the same form I have already used. I do deny them all and each as 'criminating the Society.' It would be idle waste of time to enter into a detail of such charges," &c. And so he leaves the case in the hands of the *Constitution*. Poor Mr. Dallas! it would be cruel to say a word more about him.

There is a passage in one of Mr. Webster's letters with which I will close the correspondence between him and the *Society of Irish Church Missions*. He makes a case thus: What, he says, would be thought of a bishop, if he offered to give clergymen livings if they would only promise to put their schools under the National Board? What would be thought of a bishop who would exhort such clergy to join the National Board, merely on the grounds that their adherence to their *conscientious* convictions would entail great privations upon themselves or the children of their parishes? The conscientious supporter of the Church Education Society would, of course, indignantly reject any such

* Letter to the *Cork Constitution*. Appendix, p. 84, et seq. In a postscript to this letter Mr. Webster writes as follows:—"I think I have some reason to complain that *The Irish Church Missions* have published a pamphlet containing the correspondence between Mr. Eade and me, and also Mr. Eade's letter to the Editor of the *Constitution*, dated January 30th, and omitting my reply to that letter, dated February 2nd, which appeared in the *Constitution* the very day after Mr. Eade's letter appeared."

† The italics in this passage are the Author's.

offers, in spite of the privations such rejection would entail. We should all agree in sympathising with him in his distress; and why? Because we are all prepared to honour the man who does *what he believes to be right*. "Are we, then, to feel this sympathy for Protestants, who are grievously in error, and is there to be no sympathy felt for our Roman Catholic brethren? Is it to be a sin too horrible to be conceived, to bribe a Protestant, and is it to be perfectly allowable to bribe a Roman Catholic? If a poor destitute mother is able to see her children starving, when she knows she can easily give them bread and clothes if she only does what *she believes to be abominable in the eyes of God*,* and if, in spite of this temptation, she still bears up and witnesses day after day, the sufferings of the little innocents—are we to have no sympathy with such a mother? If she looks up to heaven and resolves to die rather than do what she believes to be displeasing to God, is she to have no pity from us, merely because we believe she is very much *mistaken* in her notions of what is true? I feel almost ashamed at being driven into such questions as these; and yet these are the very questions at issue between the Irish Church Missions and all Protestants who are opposed to that Society."†

The sham discussions which were carried on under the auspices of the Society, and which Mr. Webster has so completely exposed, were numerous in Dublin and the suburbs; but it was all but impossible to get sufficient evidence concerning them. Many years ago, when the Author was a curate in Kingstown, the bible-readers of the Society used to go about the roads, waylay the priests during their walks, and endeavour to draw them into a discussion, by asking them in an apparently humble and respectful manner to interpret a text of Scripture for them which they pointed out—always in a Douay Testament. Of course it was a favourite controversial text noted for them by their superiors. These men were obliged to make weekly reports, of which we possess a number printed in pamphlet form; and it was an important event for them to meet a priest. If he said a few words to them, the incident was reported as an interesting discussion with a Popish priest; if he passed on and said nothing, the assumption was that he was afraid to be confronted with the Word of God. When the children of the Bird's Nest in Kingstown were out for recreation, they were taught, when they met a priest, to say in concert, and loud enough to be heard by him—"Is there a man in the host;" and this was repeated until he had passed the whole

* These italics are the Author's.

† Letter No. II. in Appendix, p. 60 of the Correspondence.

band, walking two deep. The poor children, not knowing what the phrase meant, often mistook their lesson, and addressing the priest direct, called him "The man in the host." These things have happened to the Author.

Such insults have, we believe, been discontinued or nearly so. Influential friends of the Society, convinced that the aggressive system was a mistake, induced the heads of the Society to give it up, although the Society was founded on this system by Mr. Dallas, and although, when Dr. Forbes was in Connaught in 1852, complaints were made to him of the obtrusiveness of the bible-readers. "I heard more than one Catholic," he writes, "complain a good deal of the annoyance of the domiciliary visits of the Scripture readers; and one Protestant inhabitant in a country district near Clifden, accused these young men of being often deficient both in courtesy and good sense, in their dealings with the poor people in their houses. Their zeal, he said, greatly exceeded their knowledge and far outstripped their discretion."*

Although the aggressive system of the *Irish Church Missions* has fallen into disrepute with its friends, and is to a great extent discontinued, the accounts from various agents in the annual English Reports are still most misleading. In "The Story of the Irish Church Missions" under the year 1855, we find this entry:—"Belfast: A great impulse was given to Missionary work in this town by means of the Discussion Class. A Roman Catholic champion was sent from Scotland for the purpose of putting down the proselytism, and a challenge from the President of the Catholic Defence Association (?) drew together hundreds of listeners, among whom were great numbers of Romanists; and the Mission house being too small to hold them, the meeting was transferred to Wellington Hall, where a discussion took place on different doctrines of the Church of Rome. There was much interest shown and no excitement. But the champion did not long continue on the platform; on the second night he very suddenly retired, leaving an immense crowd to be addressed by the Agents of the Mission."† This looks very like one of those sham discussions exposed by Rev. Mr. Webster. The idea of the Catholics of Belfast sending to Scotland for a champion to put down proselytism in their town only provokes ridicule in Ireland, but the Agents of the Society seem to think anything will go down with their English subscribers. Then the *stage effect* of his sudden retirement, when the crowd was greatest, is really admirable. Unfortunately for this highly effective scene, I find no

* Memorandums made in Ireland in 1852, Vol. I., p. 254.

† Story of the Irish Church Missions, p. 158.

account of it in the Report of 1855. The account of the Belfast Mission in it is of a very lugubrious kind. The Missionary of the place had resigned, and the Committee found it "difficult" or rather "impossible" to provide a successor. One of the local clergy, Rev. Mr. Cathcart, was induced to look after the converts (?) and this *ad interim* arrangement soon became permanent. He had, according to the Report, "already collected an inquiring class," and we are further told that it was "attended *exclusively* by persons who, on the spot, have been led to forsake the Church of Rome" (!) If they had forsaken the Church of Rome what need of further inquiry?

Thinking that the defeat of the great Scotch champion would, if printed at all, appear in the English report of 1855 or 1856, and not finding it in that of 1855, I went to 1856, but to no purpose. People asking questions in the controversial class night after night, the posting of 4,500 controversial placards and the distribution of 91,000 handbills, I found chronicled; and how surprising it was that so many Romanists were anxious to be possessed of the word of God, and their great thankfulness on receiving copies of it, &c., &c. The Scotch champion was no where to be found, except in the "Story of the Irish Church Missions," which was printed just *twenty* years after his supposed defeat. It was a safe interval. In the English Report of the Society, published this year (1886), we find a new Missionary in Belfast. He had been only six months appointed; and he writes as if he were the first Missionary who was ever there. "Close observation," he says, "during the past six months has led me to conclude that Belfast is well adapted for Mission work among Roman Catholics." These look like the words of a man who felt that no missionary work had been done there before his time. What then about the work of twenty glorious years before? What about the discomfiture of the Scotch Catholic champion, and his hurried exit? The new Missionary has great ragged schools, he says. The best thing, however, in his report is his account of the controversial classes. Here is what he says:—"I take this opportunity of offering my sincere thanks to Archdeacon Seaver, Rev. Dr. Hanna, Dr. Kane, and Rev. N. E. Smith for their kindness in placing at my disposal their schoolrooms for controversial classes. The meetings were well attended, and have, I trust, been productive of much good."*

If this passage does not enlighten the English subscribers

* English Report for 1885, pub. 1886.

we fear there is no hope of doing it. Do those subscribers know anything about the social condition of Belfast? Do they know that it is an exception to the whole of the United Kingdom in that respect? The Catholics as a rule live to themselves in certain portions of the town, and the Protestants, who are nearly all Orangemen, do the same. The usual intercourse of neighbours cannot be said to exist among them. The President of the present Commission of Inquiry said, some days ago, that this was a deplorable state of things. No doubt it is, but will it be cured? Not soon, I fear. I do not go into the reasons for this opinion, but I do believe the cure will not be wrought for a long time to come. The idea of Catholics going into a Protestant school-house in one of the Protestant quarters of Belfast to hear their faith traduced is simply absurd to us in Ireland; but the idea of any Catholic crossing the threshold of Dr. Kane's school-house for such a purpose is an insult to our understandings; yet it is pabulum quite good enough, the Missionary seems to think, for the English subscribers. For who is Dr. Kane? He is the recognised leader of the Orangemen of Orange Belfast. Dr. Hanna, at the time he was pilloried in *Punch*, and for a good while after, held the important position of leader of these Orangemen; but great as he was, and still is, amongst them, he had to make way for Dr. Kane. Dr. Hanna has stood his ground, and did not run away from the Commission of Inquiry. He was examined before it; but Dr. Kane was so seriously compromised during the riots that he prudently went to Canada, *to organize, it is reported, opposition to the Home Rule movement.* The new Missionary of Belfast, with his six months' experience, feels bound to thank Dr. Kane for the use of his school-house for the purpose of holding controversial classes in it; that is, to discuss Catholic tenets with Catholics. We would wish to see it proved that even one Belfast Catholic ever crossed the threshold of Dr. Kane's school-house for such a purpose. Will this baseless assumption, bold as it is baseless, not awaken English subscribers? We fear not. Will the Commission of Inquiry not awaken them? We fear not. Will they read the Commissioners' Report? Some may, but we fear it will not influence them. The craze of turning the Irish Papists into good Protestants is so inveterately rooted in the hearts of a large number of English Protestants, that it seems next to impossible to eradicate it.

The limited account, which the space at our disposal enables us to give of a few out of the many proselytizing societies which have assailed the faith of Ireland, gives but a meagre idea of the battle which its Catholic people have had to fight under

this division of the warfare. Their heroic struggles during the famine of 1847 and the years which immediately followed, have, there can be no doubt, won for untold numbers the martyr's crown. Like the forty martyrs of old, abundance was offered, forced upon them—food, clothing, everything necessary to save their lives: they resisted all, they gave up their lives and kept the Faith.

It may seem surprising to many that an organization like the *Society of Irish Church Missions* could be called into existence by such a man as Mr. Dallas. In his "Story" of this Society, in his letters, in his paper upon Conscience, wherever in fact we meet him, he exhibits few or none of those qualities which people expect in a man who has accomplished something great. There are three reasons which go far to account for his success. They were, (1) the proselytizing craze spoken of above, which has perennial existence in England, (2) the opportunity afforded by the Irish Famine for abolishing Popery in this land, which Mr. Dallas declared should be seized and utilized for that purpose,* and (3) Mr. Dallas's unlimited confidence in himself.

So much for the founder; now for the Society itself. Any reader of Dr. Forbes's book and Chancellor Webster's letters will see how wanting in all the higher qualities of religious instruction the agents of the Society were, and no doubt now are. It exaggerated its success most enormously, but had it succeeded to the full extent which it laid claim to, nay, to the full extent desired by Mr. Dallas and his supporters, how few real Protestants it would have made! We could never find, that its agents did anything more than teach the children who went to them the intensest hatred of Pope and Popery, and get them to commit to memory a few texts of Scripture—not those enjoining the practice of the moral virtues, or inculcating Christian charity, but such as could be used for controversial purposes against Rome. They

* "It seemed a time to take advantage of, for the further testing of the missionary effort."¹

"The famine of 1847 brought on a new crisis in the minds of the Irish people, loosening them from priestly power and preparing them to receive the Gospel. The means by which the truth was brought to them [the Famine] bore the mark of a Divine Hand, and led to results beyond the utmost expectation of those who were employed in the work."²

The reader will not fail to note that in the above passage, Divine Providence seems to be directly charged with producing the Famine, with the object of aiding the *Society of Irish Church Missions to the Roman Catholics*.

¹ Story of the Irish Church Missions, p. 25.

² Preface, p. xvii.

taught and, as far as I know, teach NO CREED WHATEVER ; and hence they teach no distinct form of religious belief. The result of such a system is clear enough. They succeed in destroying the faith of poor Catholic children who come under their influence, but do not make them Protestants ; they make them miserable, creedless beings, and no doubt, in some cases, decided unbelievers. What a result from such labour and outlay ! For the average income of the Society has been something like £30,000 a year from its establishment. It even touched £40,000 at one time, although its income is now much below that amount.

Its total Receipts in 1885 were £22,411, 7s. 1d. Of this sum £3,108, 18s. 3d. is derived from legacies.

It counts amongst its subscribers four prelates only, but this rarity of Episcopal patronage is somewhat compensated for by an array of between thirty and forty titled subscribers, some of them the highest in the land. For instance our late wonderfully popular Viceroy, the Earl of Aberdeen, appears in this year's Report as a subscriber of £55, and his amiable and equally popular Countess for £10, 10s.

The Society of Church Missions to the Irish Roman Catholics has seen its best day, but let no Catholic disregard it. There is work in it yet. To despise or ignore this fact, would be a grievous mistake, which those who are charged with the great and solemn duty of protecting the Faith of Ireland are not likely to commit.

The Author has now reached the point which he had assigned to himself for bringing this volume to a close. The large and interesting field of Irish History and Catholic effort, which surrounds Emancipation, he leaves to be dealt with by others. His design was to describe those fierce assaults that have been avowedly made on Ireland's faith since the Reformation. Other struggles there were of undying interest. But he ventures to hope that the reader will find in this volume a narrative from which he may understand the heroic battle that left us, after three centuries of terrible conflict, a Church to emancipate in 1829, and to salute to-day as the rising hope of Christianity in Western Europe.

NOTES.

NOTE A.—FINDING OF THE SILVER BULLET AT CLONMEL.

AFTER the repulse and terrible slaughter of his men, it is said that Cromwell decided on retiring from Clonmel, having made up his mind that he had not forces sufficient to take the place. But he accidentally found a silver bullet in the grass, evidently fired out by the garrison, and the fact suggested to him that O'Neill must be out, or on the point of being out of ammunition, since he was driven to the extremity of melting down his silver for bullets. He changed his mind, and determined to call from the out-garrisons such reinforcements as could be spared, and continue the siege.

Everything connected with Cromwell's operations before Clonmel points to the conclusion, that this Silver-bullet story is either a pure invention, or a greatly distorted account. 1. It would have been extremely damaging to Cromwell's reputation to retire defeated from Clonmel—a view which he puts plainly forward, in his pressing message to Lord Broghill to hasten to his assistance; nor would the summons he had received to return to England cover his retreat, or excuse his failure. 2. It is extremely improbable that O'Neill had as much silver in his military chest, as if melted down and cast into bullets, would have an appreciable effect on the issue of the conflict. 3. Had O'Neill turned his silver into bullets, surely more than one of them would have been picked up, for the soldiers would have searched closely for them, on hearing of Oliver's find. Two solutions of this curious story suggest themselves. (1) When a place was taken or a battle won by bribery, the style of the time was, to say the success was the result of silver bullets—a phrase which has been applied to Cromwell's victory at Dunbar. The silver bullet won many places for him in Ireland, and was certainly fired *into* Clonmel, as we know from Fennell's confession; and through years of tradition and discussion, the change from firing the silver bullet *in*, instead of firing it *out*, would not be a very violent one. (2) It may have been a *ruse* of Oliver's own, to induce his beaten and cowed legions once again to face O'Neill.

At any rate the circumstance is mysterious, suspicious, and unique.

I find by recent inquiries that the story as related in Hall's Ireland, still survives in Tipperary.

NOTE B.—HUGH DUFF O'NEILL.

HUGH O'NEILL, the famous defender of Clonmel and Limerick, was the son of Art O'Neill, surnamed Oge, brother of Owen Roe O'Neill. He is mentioned as Hugh M'Art Oge, Hugh Boy (*Buidhe*), or the swarthy, referring to his sallow complexion, and Hugh Duff (*Dubh*), the black, which no doubt indicates the colour of his hair, sallow people usually having black hair. He was born in the Spanish Netherlands. He

learned the art of war in the "martial theatre of Flanders," and came to Ireland with his uncle Owen Roe in 1642. He was taken prisoner at Clones in 1643, and did not recover his liberty till 1646, when he was exchanged after the battle of Benburb, and received the appointment of Major-General in the Ulster Army. This army was partly under his command during the last illness of his uncle, who despatched him in advance with 2,000 foot to Ormonde, in fulfilment of his agreement with that nobleman. Hugh was desirous to succeed his uncle as Commander-in-Chief of the Ulster army, and whoever examines the history of the time, must regard it as an irreparable calamity to the cause for which they fought, that he did not receive the appointment. He was in Clonmel when it was made, but that should not have been a bar to his getting it; nor was it put forward as such. The appointment of Heber M'Mahon was a compromise, the result of divided councils.

In Limerick his position was one of great difficulty. He was always on excellent terms with Ormonde, and in some sense represented him as Governor of Limerick; but the clergy, having lost all confidence in the slippery Marquis, declared that the government of Ireland should not continue in his hands, and they published an excommunication against those who would countenance or adhere to him. On this matter Hugh O'Neill thus writes to Ormonde:—"I could wish myself rather out of the world, than to be witness to the calamities and afflictions which will, undoubtedly, issue upon this revolution, if not speedily prevented by your Excellency's wisdom, in endeavouring a right understanding betwixt you and the clergy. Your Excellency knoweth what religion I profess, and that I cannot in conscience, but make a scruple of being any way subject to so heavy a sentence as that of excommunication."*

After having escaped death on the surrender of Limerick, Hugh O'Neill and Colonel Alex. M'Donnell were sent to England. O'Neill was committed to the Tower in 1652; the hire of his chamber there was paid by the State, which also ordered him an allowance of twenty shillings a week, and "the liberty of the Tower."† In July of the same year the Spanish Ambassador at London applied officially for his discharge from the Tower, on the ground, amongst others, that he was a subject of the King of Spain. The application was granted, and he was permitted to end his days in Spanish territory. He assumed the title of Earl of Tyrone in Spain, and the English Envoy at Madrid, Henry Bennet, afterwards Earl of Arlington, in a letter to Ormonde, dated 27th of October, 1660, proved, from papers shown him by O'Neill, that he was the true heir to the title. There is another letter of the same date from Madrid, written by O'Neill himself to Ormonde, enclosing one for Charles II., and entreating Ormonde's good offices with the King in his behalf, that his Majesty would extend his grace and favour to him, and restore him to the position which his family held in the "esteem and favour of his Royal progenitors." This, he seeks more for his successors than for himself, for, he writes to Ormonde, "God knows how little ground I have in my health to promise myself the long enjoyment of this grace, but His holy will being done concerning me, it would be a great satisfaction to me in the meantime to see my unfortunate family restored by it to a possi-

* Letter to Ormonde, 18th Sept., 1650.

† "D. Hugo O'Neill in arce regia sine ullius accessu aut recessu tenatur. D. Alexander M'Donnell in alio distincto loco tenetur captionis."—Letter of Fr. Franciscus Magruairk [Mac or O'Rourke], a S. Maria. *Spic. Ossor.*, Vol. L, p. 360.

bility of deserving well of the Crown, which a long and sad experience will have taught them to value as they ought to."

The letter to the King was in substance the same as that written to Ormonde. No attention seems to have been paid to those letters. In 1673, Charles conferred the title of Earl of Tyrone on Richard Power, Lord Le Poer and Curraghmore, from whom it has descended to the present Marquis of Waterford. I have not been able to obtain the date of Hugh Duff O'Neill's death, but the presumption is, that it occurred before 1673, when the Earldom of Tyrone passed from the O'Neills to a family unconnected with them or Ulster.—*See Gilbert's learned and interesting Preface to the third Volume of the Aphorismical Discovery, p. xl. et seq.*

NOTE D.—BAGGOT RATH (pp. 475-6).

ON maps of the city of Dublin and its environs, the word Baggotrath is found printed across a considerable portion of ground at the south side, stretching from St. Stephen's green towards Ball's bridge and Donnybrook. The name is said to be derived from the family of Baggot or Bagot, once the owners of the property; the exact site of the Rath itself cannot be now fixed with certainty as no trace of it has existed for a long time, but a pretty accurate approximation to it can be arrived at. When the battle of Rathmines was fought, Baggotrath was in a ruinous state, and was intended to be strengthened only in a temporary manner by Ormonde in order to afford accommodation for a detachment of troops, sufficient to prevent the Dublin garrison from feeding their horses on the pastures south of the Liffey. In Sir W. Petty's map of the county Dublin, Rathmines is placed immediately south of St. Kevin's—now well within the city—which would be that part of Rathmines at present adjoining Portobello bridge. If we draw a line from a point a little south of Portobello bridge to Ringsend (then the usual landing place from England), Baggotrath, as figured on the map, would fall somewhat to the west of the line, and a little nearer to Ringsend than to Rathmines. Carte says Baggotrath was only half a mile from the latter place, but it was probably a full English mile; at the same time it must be borne in mind that Ormonde's army covered a large space of ground, so that a portion of it may have been encamped within half a mile of Baggotrath.

Having examined the locality in which Baggotrath must have stood, it seems to me that its site may be fixed with much probability east of Lower Baggot street, a little to the south of its junction with Merrion row. The name Baggotrath still exists in that place. There is a small street or lane called Baggotrath place, running from Lower Baggot street, nearly opposite to Lower Pembroke street, to the rear of the houses on the south side of Merrion square, and making a right angle with them. The house in the square opposite to the rear of which Baggotrath place terminates, has, like others of those houses, two numbers, the old number being xi., and the new one 77. It is the eleventh house from Upper Merrion street, and is notably higher than the neighbouring houses. Everything leads to the conclusion that Baggotrath stood at this place or in the immediate vicinity of it.

There are no houses marked on Petty's map between Baggotrath and the Liffey, except Trinity College, which is considerably to the west of the above imaginary line; a place known as Lazars hill, east of the line, is represented by some dots, probably indicating a few small houses.

So that the large space which falls between Baggotrath at one side, and Trinity College and Ringsend on the other, represents the fields in which the horses of the city garrison were accustomed to graze.

NOTE E.—JAMES II.

“THE attestation of Sir David Nairne concerning what he knew of the life and virtues of the late King of Great Britain, James the Second.”

TRANSLATION.

Paris, 1734.

“As I have the honour of having been near thirteen years in the service of the late King of Great Britain, James the Second, of blessed and holy memory, of having followed him, in that time, to Ireland, La Hogue, and Calais, and of having been everywhere a witness of his holy life, especially at St. Germain's, where I had likewise the misfortune to be present at his last sickness and death; it is supposed that I, old as I am, at the age of seventy-nine years almost complete, I may be still able to recollect some circumstances of the life of that prince. To begin, I can attest with truth, that I have always observed in King James the Second, of happy memory, a great fund of goodness and religion, an upright mind, a good heart, a great regularity of life, a paternal affection for all his loyal subjects and servants; and above all, an inviolable attachment to the Holy See, and to the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Religion; to which he had already sacrificed his three crowns, and was disposed to sacrifice further his life, if necessary, as he often protested.

“I attest that during the residence of that prince at St. Germain's, he heard ordinarily two Masses every day, one in the morning and another towards noon. That he performed his devotions on all great festivals, and likewise on several other days of the year, and then heard, for the most part, three Masses, and if, on these days, there were Vespers, Sermon, and exaltation of the Host at the parish church of the Recolects, he was there; and in every Lent and Advent, he had sermons in his Chapel thrice a week, and he never failed to go there regularly, attended always by the Queen, his religious comfort, who was likewise, as every one knows, an example of piety. They went likewise together, every year, on foot, to the procession of the Holy Sacrament, with the parish, over all the town of St. Germain's. On the day and Octave of Corpus Christi, and at the return of the long procession, they staid to hear High Mass at the parish church; and on every evening during the Octave they were present at the exaltation of the Host; and as there was scarcely a Sunday or a great holiday during the year but there was an exaltation at the parish church, their Majesties were always present; and where there was no established fund for saying Mass, they ordered one to be said, which kept up a great deal of devotion in the place, and edified every one.

“He charged some of his chaplains to take care, that none of his Catholic servants failed to perform their devotions regularly at Easter.

“He practised, from time to time, spiritual retirements, for seven or eight days, in some religious house at Paris, from whence he went every day incognito, with a few attendants, to visit churches, and to be present at sermons' Masses and services; and when it was Easter week, he went to

the passion sermon and night offices. He was likewise three or four times in retirement at La Trappe ; one of which times I remember to have been, as he was, on his way to La Hogue. He staid there usually three days, practising nearly the same abstinence with the monks, and being present at a great part of their service. . . .

"His great charity appeared in this that God gave him grace to forgive cordially all his enemies, and pray for them ; and by name for the Emperor, and even the Prince of Orange, saying aloud, that he was in some measure obliged to his enemies, for the mercy which he hoped God would show him ; because if he had remained on his throne, and continued always in prosperity, he would not, perhaps, have ever thought of the great work of his salvation, as seriously and as efficaciously as he ought." Macpherson's *Original Papers*, Vol. I. [sometimes labelled on back, Vol. III.] p. 590.

This account of the closing years of James the Second's life will edify every good charitable Christian. Penance for past sins is a leading principle of the religion of Jesus Christ, and Mr. Wade's sneers at James's penitential exercises in his retirement manifest his ignorance as well as his malice.

NOTE F.

THE Parliament which met on 16th December, 1699, took up with great earnestness the question of the forfeited estates in Ireland. A bill was sent up by the Commons for attainting the Irish who had been in arms, and applying their estates to the discharge of the public debts, reserving a power to the King to dispose of the third part of them. The Commons accused him of granting away the estates ; this was a very sore point for the King and his favourites ; so he promised that the matter should remain as it stood till the next Parliament, and put an end to the session. But the next session passed over without the matter being taken up at all. Meantime the King granted away all those confiscations, assuming that it was part of the prerogative of the Crown, that all confiscations accrued to it, and were grantable at the King's pleasure. They were of the enormous value of over £1,500,000 ! It was alleged that in many cases the lands had been given to unworthy persons. Attempts had been made to have those grants confirmed in the Parliament of Ireland, but the Earl of Athlone's was the only one confirmed. The Court party endeavoured to defeat the Act of Resumption, by proposing to have it extended back to 1660, and thus include former reigns. This would not be listened to, as it was said the thing would become too perplexing after so long a time.

Finally, a commission was given by Act of Parliament to seven persons named by the House, to inquire into the value of the forfeited estates, so granted away, and into the consideration upon which these grants were made. The Commissioners took up their duties with great zeal, and in due time presented an exhaustive report. They found that the total value of the lands confiscated, for what they called the late rebellion, amounted to £1,699,343, 14s, besides a grant under the great seal of Ireland, dated 30th May, 1695, passed to Mrs. Elizabeth Villiers, now Countess of Orkney, of all the private estates of the late King James (except some small part in grant to the Lord Athlone), containing 95,649 acres, worth per annum, £25,995, 18s.*

"The Commissioners having examined this report, on the 15th of

* This lady appears to have been first favourite with William, as he made her a countess, and endowed her so royally.

December, came to an unanimous resolution, 'that a bill be brought in to apply all the forfeited estates and interests in Ireland, and all grants thereof, and of the rents and revenues belonging to the Crown within that kingdom, since the 13th of February, 1688, to the use of the public; and ordered a clause to be inserted in the bill, for erecting a judicature for determining claims touching the said forfeited estates of Ireland.'

"On the 18th of January, 1700, the Commons entered into a further resolution that the advising, procuring, and passing these grants had occasioned great debts upon the Nation, and heavy taxes upon the people, and highly reflected upon the King's honour, and that the officers and instruments concerned in the same, had highly failed in the performance of their trust and duty." This resolution having been presented to the King, on the 15th of February, he returned the following answer on the 21st.

"GENTLEMEN—I was not only led by inclination, but thought myself obliged in justice, to reward those who had served well, and particularly in the reduction of Ireland, out of the estates forfeited to me by the rebellion there. The longwar in which we were engaged did occasion great taxes, and has left the Nation much in debt; and the taking just and effectual ways for lessening that debt, and supporting public credit, is what, in my opinion, will best contribute to the honour, interest, and safety of the kingdom."

This answer, coolly ignoring the very grave question put before the King by the Commons, infuriated them, and they at once resolved "That whoever had advised it had used his utmost endeavours to create a misunderstanding and jealousy between the King and his people." They then proceeded with the Bill of Resumption, that is with the bill for taking back the forfeited estates from those to whom the King had given them. The Court party were in fear and trembling over the matter, yet were not without some hope that the Lords would find a way of shelving the question; but the Commons anticipating this, consolidated the Bill of Resumption with a money bill, so that both should be passed or neither. Thus did the Commons triumph over the King and House of Lords.

The Commons believed, justly as it seems to me, that Lord Chancellor Somers inspired the King's answer. This so enraged them, that with closed doors, to exclude peers and favourites from the House, they proceeded with the debate on the report of the Commissioners of the forfeited estates. Afterwards a question was moved "that an address be made to his Majesty, to remove John Lord Somers, Lord Chancellor of England, from his presence and Councils for ever." But the motion did not command a majority. However, the King had seen and heard enough to cause him, after some time, to ask Somers to give up the custody of the great seal, which he vehemently refused to do, without a written command from his Majesty. This command the King accordingly sent him.—*Harris's Life of William III.*, Vol. IV., p. 315, *et seq.*, &c.,

APPENDIX I.

THE Act for the Registering of the Popish Clergy is a portion of that singularly complete system of laws enacted in Queen Anne's reign, for the annihilation of the Catholic Religion in Ireland. It has challenged the admiration of many distinguished men, on account of the consummate skill with which it was framed for the attainment of its object. Burke says of it:—"You abhorred it, as I did, for its vicious perfection. For I must do it justice. It was a complete system of coherence and consistency; well digested and well composed in all its parts. It was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance; and was well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man." (*Letter to Langrishe*, p. 87.) It has often occurred to the Author, when reading over the penal statutes of Anne's reign by the light of Catholicity as it exists to-day amongst us, that the crafty men who drew them up with such diabolical skill, might as well have applied themselves to the making of laws for the abolition of the Shamrock in Ireland.

Two points in this Act are well worthy of attention. 1. The preamble says, "Whereas two Acts lately made for banishing all Regulars of the Popish Clergy out of this Kingdom, and to *prevent the Popish priests from coming into the same*, &c. 2. And it is further enacted by the authority aforesaid that *no Popish parish priest* shall keep or have any Popish Curate, Assistant or Coadjutor, &c." So that as no more priests were to be permitted to come into Ireland, and as parish priests were to have no assistants—in one generation Popery was to be a thing of the past amongst us! Still it survives—"not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of youthful life and vigour."

AN ACT FOR REGISTRING THE POPISH CLERGY.

WHEREAS two Acts lately made for banishing all Regulars of the Popish Clergy out of this kingdom, and to prevent Popish Priests from coming into the same, may be wholly eluded unless the government be truly informed of the number of such dangerous persons as

still remain among us: for remedy whereof, be it enacted by the Queen's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons in the present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that all and every Popish Priest or Priests who are now in this Kingdom, shall not at the next general quarter sessions of the peace to be held in all the several counties, and counties of cities or towns throughout this kingdom, next after the feast of St. John the Baptist, which shall be in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and four, return his or their names and places of abode to the respective clerks of the peace in the several counties, or counties of cities, or towns in this Kingdom, where the said Popish Priests shall dwell or reside, together with his or their age, the parish of which they pretend to be Popish Priest, the time and place of his or their first receiving Popish Orders, and from whom he or they first received the same; and shall then and there enter into sufficient sureties, each in the penal sum of fifty pounds sterling, *that every such Popish Priest shall be of peaceable behaviour, and not remove out of such county where his or their place of abode lies*, into any other part of the Kingdom: and all and every Popish Priest or Priests who shall not make such return, and enter into such recognizance with sufficient sureties as aforesaid, and being thereof convicted at the Assizes or General Quarter Sessions of such County, or Counties of Cities, or Towns wherein he or they shall dwell or be apprehended, shall severally be committed to the common Gaol of the respective Counties, Cities, or Towns where he or they shall be convicted, there to remain without bail or mainprize till he or they be transported.

And that all and every Popish Priest or Priests so convicted as aforesaid, shall be transported out of this Kingdom, in like manner as Popish Regulars, and incur like penalties upon their return into the same as are inflicted on Popish Regulars, by an Act entitled, "*An Act for banishing all Papists exercising any Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and all Regulars of the Popish Clergy out of this Kingdom*;" and all and every the clerks of the Peace are hereby required to transmit within twenty days after every such Quarter Sessions all and every such return to the Clerk of the Council in this Kingdom, upon the penalty to forfeit to her Majesty, her heirs and successors, the sum of ten pounds sterling for every such neglect to do the same; the said penalty to be recovered by bill, plaint, or information in any of her Majesty's Courts of Record: which transmitting of the said return shall be incumbent on them, the said Clerks of the Crown and Peace, to prove by a receipt in writing, under the hand of the said Clerk of the Council, who is hereby required, without fee or reward, to give such receipt, on the penalty of twenty pounds sterling; which said penalty is to be recovered by bill, plaint or information, in any of her Majesty's Courts of Record: which return, so transmitted, shall be kept by the said Clerk of the Council, to be viewed by any person requiring to see the same without fee or reward.

And to the end that such Popish Priests as lately have been, or may be convicted of the errors of the Romish Church may not suffer through want of maintenance or other mischievous effects of resentment of bigotted Papists: be it enacted that every such Popish Priest being approved of as a convert, and received into the church by the Archbishop or Bishop of the Diocese wherein he or they lived or resided, and conforming himself to the Church of Ireland, as by law established, and having taken the oaths, and made and subscribed the declarations in such a manner as the conformable clergy of the Church of Ireland are obliged to do, at any Quarter Sessions, in any County or City aforesaid, such converted Priest or Priests shall have and receive the sum of twenty pounds sterling yearly and every year during their residence in such County for their maintenance, and until they are otherwise provided for; subject nevertheless to suspension or deprivation of the Archbishop or Bishop of the diocese wherein he or they shall dwell or reside, in like manner as the rest of the inferior clergy of this Kingdom; the said sum of twenty pounds to be levied on the inhabitants of such County, or Counties of Cities, or Towns where such converted Priest or Priests did last officiate or reside, in like manner as money is levied that is charged by Grand Juries upon the said Counties, or Counties of Cities, or Towns, and to be paid him or them by equal moieties, viz. : one moiety at the Feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the other moiety at the Feast of St. Michael the Archangel, in every year: and every such convert or converts shall publicly read the Common Prayer or Liturgy of the Church of Ireland, in the English or Irish Tongue in such place and at such times as the said Archbishops or Bishops shall direct or appoint.

And it is further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that *no Parish Priest shall keep or have any Popish Curate, Assistant, or Coadjutor*: and that all and every Popish Priest that shall neglect to register himself, pursuant to this Act, shall depart out of this Kingdom before the twentieth day of July, which shall be in the year of our Lord One thousand seven hundred and four, on pain of being prosecuted as a Popish Regular Clergyman: and that all such Popish Priest and Priests that shall neglect to register him or themselves as aforesaid, and remain in this Kingdom after the said twentieth day of July, shall be esteemed a Popish Regular Clergyman, and prosecuted as such.

Provided always, that this Act shall be given in charge at every General Assizes; and the list of such Priests that are registered shall be publicly read after the charge given: this Act to continue in force for five years, and until the end of the next succeeding parliament, and no longer.

We give the following specimens of the way in which the names were registered:—

*Com. Ar- { A LIST of the Names of the Popish Parish Priests as they are Register'd at a General Sessions of the
mag. } Peace held at Lurgan, for the said County of Armagh, the Twelfth day of July, 1704, and were since
Return'd up to the Council Office in Dublin, pursuant to a Clause in the late Act of Parliament,
Intituled, "An Act for Registering the Popish Clergy."*

Popish Priests' Names.	Place of Abode.	Parishes of which they pre- sented to be Popish Priests.	Year Orders recd.	Places where they received Orders.	From whom they received them.	Sureties Names that entered into Recognizance for such Priests according to the said Act.
John Parlon	Latbrigidy.	54 Up. part Parish of Killevy.	1672	Ballybarick, near Dundalk, C. Lowth	Dr. Oliver Plunket, Popish Archbishop, Armagh.	Abraham Booth, Carrickstock ad. Co. gent. 501. Daniel Callaghan, Lisbry, ad. co. husbandman, 501.
Bryan Heny	Magherne- hely.	50 Low. part Par. Killevy.	1672	Dundalk, County of Lowth.	Do.	Pat. Savage, Maghernehely, said co. gent. 501. Pat M'Arde, Ma- hernehely, ad. co. yeoman, 501.
Jas. Calla- ghan.	Killevy.	60 Mid. part Parish of Killevy.	1666	Dublin, in the County of Dublin.	Dr. Patk. Plunket, Popish Bishop, Meath.	Edm. of said co. yeoman, 501. Hugh Callaghan, Aghatraghan, ad. co. yeoman, 501.
Peter Finan.	Cassel.	50 Loughgilly.	1675	Ardpatrick, in the Co. of Lowth.	Dr. Oliver Plunket, Popish Archbishop, Armagh.	Edm. Mac Ivalley, Tullinerry, ad. Co. yeoman, 501. Jacob Daly, Tullinerry, ad. co. yeoman, 501.
Terence Neill.	Sigaghan.	41 Kilcluney.	1690	Strookstown, in the County of	Dr. Dominick Burk, Popish Bishop of Elphin.	Nelle MacKee, Ballymacnab, ad. co. Yeo. 501. Laughlin MacGrana, Killmore, ad. co. yeoman, 501.
Patrick Donnelly.	Corrimal- lagh.	55 Part parish Newry in Co. Armagh.	1673	Dundalk, in the County of Lowth.	Dr. Oliver Plunket, Popish Archbishop, Armagh.	Terence Murphy, Lurgan, ad. co. yeoman, 501. Patrick Guiniffe, Lurgan, said co. yeoman, 501.
Owen Don- nelly.		55 Armagh.	1672	Bollibark, near Dundalk, C. Lowth	Do.	Terence Murphy, Lurgan, said County. yeoman, 501.
John Byrne.	Ballyni- mony.	47 Segoe.	1683	Origin, C. Galway.	Dr. Thady Keogh, Popish Bishop of Clonfert.	Christoph. Willson, Derryarvin, ad. Co. yeoman 501. Henry Guin- iffe, Lurgan, said Co. 501.
Owen Gonnley.	Carrick- clean.	57 Tynam.	1670	Bridge, C. Lowth.	Dr. Oliver Plunket, Popish Archbp. of Armagh.	Patk. Savage, Maghernehely, ad. Co. gent. 501. Edmond Hughes, of Middletown, ad. Co. gent. 501.
Hugh Quin.	Tassagh.	45 Tassagh.	1690	Stroakstown C.	Dr. Dominick Burk, Popish Bishop of Elphin.	Alexander Trelld, Lurgan, ad. co. Glasier, 501. William Forbes, of Knockcaver, ad. Co. yeoman, 501.

Patrick Murphy.	Timore.	55	Part parish of Cregan.	1672	Bollybark, near Dundalk C.	Dr. Oliver Plunket, Popish Archbp of Armagh.	Corm. McCann, Tandragee, sd. Co. gent. 50l. Carol. Murphy, Magher- leowbegg, sd. Co. yeoman, 50l.
DI. Mac Gilmurry.	Carnally.	44	Part parish of Cregan.	1676	Artpatrick, C. of Lowth.	Do.	Edmund Hughes, Midletown, sd. Co. gent. 50l. Dr. Haignan, Agh- naclohy, sd. Co. yeoman, 50l.
Patrick	Derrycoose.	54	Loughgall and Tar- taraghon.	1684	Cregin, C. Galway	Dr. Thady Keogh, Popish Bishop of Clontarf.	Edmund Murphy, Knockcamor, sd. Co. yeoman, 50l. Pk. Guiniffe, Lurgan, sd. Co. yeoman, 50l.
Parlan.	Tullymore.	44	Killmore and Drum- cree.	1684	Sevil, in Spain.	Ambrose Spinola, Popish Archbishop of Sevil.	Edmund Hughes, Midletown, sd. Co. gent. 50l. Johan Derry, Bal- lynen, sd. Co. yeoman, 50l.
Bryan	Cavagh.	51	Derenuse.	1680	County of	Dr. Mark Forstal, Popish Bishop of Kildare.	John Gormul, Tullyglash, sd. Co. Yeoman, 50l. Roger Drum, Mal- lon, said County, yeoman, 50l.
Keiran.	Ulleckin.	57	Tannaghly, <i>alias</i> Bal- lymore a. Tandragee.	1671	Dublin, C. Dublin	Dr. Patrick Plunket, Popish Bishop of Meath.	Cormack McCane, Tandragee, sd. Co. yeom., 50l. Pp. Murphy, Tan- dragee, said Co. yeoman, 50l.
DI. Mac	Ballymoire.	56	Mullabrache.	1671	Dublin, C. Dublin	Do.	Johan Creely, Derrybeg, sd. Co. gent. 50l. Johan Gillaspay, Kene- das, said Co. yeoman, 50l.
Gilmurry.	Sescaugh- Magerrel, C.T.	53	Part parish Cleu- feikill in County Armagh.	1670	Artpatrick, Co. of Lowth.	Dr. Oliver Plunket, Popish Archbishop, Armagh	Thomas Bond, Tyra, said county, gent. 50l. Johan Gillaspay, Bally- nemetagh, said county, yeoman, 50l.
Denis	Creenagh, do.	54	Part parish Killiman in Co. Armagh.	1673	Ballybarrick, County of Lowth.	Do.	Thomas Bond, Tyra, sd. co. Arm. gent. 50l. Johan Gillaspay, Bally- nemetagh, said co. yeoman, 50l.
Hughs.							
Roger							
Phelan.							

Com. { A LIST of the Names of the Popish Parish Priests as they are Register'd at a General Sessions of the
Dublin. { Peace held for the County of *Dublin*, at *Kilmainham*, the 13th day of *July*, 1704, and were since Return'd
up to the Council Office in *Dublin*, pursuant to a Clause in the late Act of Parliament, Intituled, "*An*
Act for Registering the Popish Clergy."

Popish Priests' Names.	Place of Abode.	Parishes in which they pretend to be Popish Priests.	Year Orders read.	Places where they received Orders.	From whom they received them.	Sureties Names that entered into Recognizance for such Priests according to the said Act.
James Gibbons.	Grangeor-man.	44 Kinsealy.	1691	Comibra, Portugal	John de Mello,	
Nichas. Jones.	Donabate.	36 Donabate.	1694	Lisbon.	Bishop of Comibra. Francis de la Maye,	
Anthony Bryan.	Rathgar.	38 Rathfarnham.	1690	Olmutz, Moravia.	Bishop of Lisbon. Jn. Jh. Count de Briner, Suffragan of Olmutz.	
John Corkeran.	Cloniske.	36 Ballrothery and Balscedan.	1693	Lisbon.	De lan Castro, Arch- bishop of Braguza.	
James Butler.	Bellamont.	44 Clondalkin.	1681	Creggin, County Galway.	Thady Keogh, Titu- lar Bp. of Clonfert.	
Charles Smith.	Balldoyle.	56 Howth.	1677	Dublin.	Patt. Plunket, Titu- lar Bishop of Meath.	
Oliver Doyle.	Escor.	39 Castleknock.	1687	Salamanca.	Don Antonio d' Cos- sio, B. of Salamanca.	
Owen Smith.	Mallahow.	54 Hollywood.	1675	Ardpatrick, Co. Lowth.	O. Plunket, Titular Archbp. of Armagh.	
Philip Mathews.	Terrills town.	54 Balldungan.	1675	Castleblayney, Co. Monaghan.	Pk. Tyrrell, Titular Bishop of Clogher.	
Richard Cabull.	Artaine.	56 Santry.	1674	Dublin.	Pk. Plunket, Titular Bishop of Meath.	

Christ. Welsh.	Swords.	58 Swords.	1670 Segovia.	Jerom Mascarenes, Bishop of Sagovia.
Edmond Murphy.	Rawleigh's town	60 Clonmethan.	1670 Belish, County Meath.	Pk. Plunket, Titular Bishop of Meath.
William Dardis.	Kill.	68 Killeney.	1642 Jacca, Spain.	Bartholomeo d'Fen- caldo, Bp. of Jacca.
Peter Stanley.	Portmar- nock.	50 Portmarnock.	1676 Ardpatrick, County Lowth.	O. Plunkett, Titular Archbp. of Armagh.
Barthol. Scally.	Dunsaugh- lin.	48 Finglas and St. Mar- garets.	1684 Comibra, Portugal	Jacobo de Bryas, Archbp. of Comibra.
Robert Taylor.	Tobergre- gan.	46 Balmadun and Gar- rinstown.	1680 Lisbon.	Don Antonio Bernardo, D. of Martinica, W. Ind.
Patrick Gillmore.	Butters- town.	49 Donnybrook.	1678 Louth.	O. Plunket, Titular Archbp. of Armagh.
William Browne.	Stradbally.	49 Kilsolgan.	1679 Rheines, France.	Charles, Bishop of Rhienes.
Francis Delamer.	Porters- town.	36 Clonsillagh.	1691 Brussels.	Humbert William, Archbp. of Mechlin.
Walter Cruce.	The Bay.	50 Malahedart.	1692 Dublin.	Patrick Russel, Tit. Archbp. of Dublin.
Manus Quigly.	Meath- street.	48 Chapelizod.	1679 Ardpatrick, County Lowth.	Oliver Plunket, Tit. Archbp. of Armagh.
Richd. Fox.	Beggars- Bush.	34 Escor.	1694 Gallyrick, County Kilkenny.	James Whelan, Tit. Bishop of Ossory.
William Brett.	Newcastle.	63 Saggard.	1671 Ghent, Flanders.	Nicholas French, Tit. Bp. of Fernes.
Francis Hughes.	Lucan.	36 Lucan.	1692 Kilkenny.	James Whelan, Tit. Bishop of Ossory.

Poplah Priests' Names.	Place of Abode.	2. 3.	Parishes of which they pretend to be Poplah Priests.	Year Orders recd.	Places where they received Orders.	From whom they received them.	Sureties Names that entered into Recognizance for such Priests according to the said Act.
Thady Kelly.	Old Castle.	50	Tallagh.	1677	Downpatrick.	Daniel M'Key, Tit.	
Owen Tee.	Ballymore Eustace.	59	Ballimore-Eustace.	1669	Dublin.	Bp. Down & Connor. Patrick Plunket, Tit.	
William Rosse.	Cruagh.	45	Cruagh.	1685	Drogheda.	Bp. of Meath.	
William Shanly.	Swords.	38	Cloghran.	1691	Galloway.	Dominick Maguire, Tit. A.B. of Armagh.	
John Talbott.	Rochestown	50	Rathmicheal.	1679	Cloncorton, County Roscomon	James Lynch, Tit. Archbishop of Tuam.	
Walter Fox.	Old Connaught.	42	Oldeconnaught.	1685	Kilkenny.	Thady Keogh, Tit. Bishop of Clonfert.	
Charles Cashel.	Coolock.	49	Coolock.	1682	Faine, County Meath.	James Whelan, Tit. Bishop of Ossory.	
James Sarsfield.	Grange-gorman.	36	Clonturk.	1695	Pedua.	Patrick Tirrell, Tit. Bishop of Meath.	
Francis Flood.	Typerkevin.	55	Typerkevin.	1681	Ardpatrik, County Lowth.	Antonio Francisco, Bishop of Padua.	
Joseph Welsh.	Knockdroman.	48	Holmpatrik and Luke.	1680	Salamanca.	Oliver Plunket, Tit.	
Richard Cannon.	White Church.	52	White Church.	1675	Ardpatrik, County Lowth.	Archbp. of Armagh.	
Patrick White.	Killternan.	52	Killternan.	1685	Kilkenny.	James Whelan, Tit. Bishop of Ossory.	

Com. } A LIST of the Names of the Popish Parish Priests as they are Register'd at a General Sessions of the Peace held at *Loughrea* in and for the said County of *Galloway*, the 11th day of *July*, 1704, and were since Return'd up to the *Council-Office*, in *Dublin*, pursuant to a Clause in the late Act of Parliament, Intituled, "*An Act for Registering the Popish Clergy.*"

Ambrose Maddin.	63	Loughreagh.	1666	Dublin.	Patrick Plunket, Tit. Bp. of Meath.
Kelly.	45	Portumna.	1680	Killconnel.	Teigh Keogh, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.
Donogh Kenedy.	45	Killymore.	1682	do.	Do.
Edmond Burke.	55	Turinard.	1679	Ballylowa.	Do.
John Coffy.	60	Balliloe.	1667	Dublin.	Patrick Plunket, Tit. Bp. of Meath.
Owen Donnellan.	50	Castlebin.	1678	Madrid.	Savius Malinus, A.B. of Cesario, Pope's Nuncio
Greg.	46	Dunas.	1680	do.	Anton. Portacarero, Archbp. of Toledo.
French.	46	Crosconlen.	1684	Creggeene.	Teige Keogh, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.
Hugh Madden.	48	Turle-vaughan.	1685	Galloway.	James Lynch, Tit. A. Bp. of Tuam.
Patrick Burne.	43	Rosmorane.	1695	Rome.	John Wincerrelly, Pope's Vicar.
Walter Costelloe.	40	Moneene.	1686	Galloway.	James Lynch, Tit. A.B. of Tuam.
Valentine Browne.	54	Adragule.	1674	Cloonbar.	James Lynch, Titular Archbishop of Tuam.
Hubbert Henry.					

Popish Priests' Names.	Place of Abode.	§ 4	Parishes in which they pretend to be Popish Priests.	Year Orders recd.	Places where they received Orders.	From whom they received them.	Sureties Names that entered into Recognizance for such Priests according to the said Act.
Owen Kelly	Ardroe.	40	Ballymacward and Cloonkeen.	1688	Garririgill.	James Phelan, Tit. Bp. of Ossory.	
Murtagh Fahy.	Ardry.	60	Ballinacourty & part of Oranmore.	1666	Dublin.	Patrick Plunket, Tit. Bp. of Meath.	
Bryan Flynn.	Graige.	55	Killasolan.	1685	Caltraghballis.	Dominick Burke, Tit. Bp. of Elphin.	
Dennis Egan.	Finagh.	55	Clonfert and Donan-aught.	1672	Kilconnel.	Teige Keogh, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.	
Francis Nally.	Fartigare.	46	Killbennane and Killconlan.	1683	Creggeene.	Do.	
Jonack M'Hugo.	Parke.	45	Kilteskill.	1682	Do.	Do.	
Edmond Knavin.	Grainge.	39	Duairy.	1690	Mechlin in Brabant.	Archbp. of Mechlin.	
Thomas Burke.	Tulliry.	60	Adraghan.	1672	Cloonbar.	James Lynch, Tit. Bp. of Tuam.	
Walter Burke.	Cappacurry.	60	Tynagh.	1668	Dublin.	Tit. Bp. of Meath.	
Charles Flynn.	Carrown-tobber.	52	Killkerino.	1674	Cloonbar.	James Lynch, Tit. A. Bp. of Tuam.	
John Dolphin.	Loghrea.	49	Killnadema.	1680	Molto.	John Mohire, Bishop of Molto.	
Carberry Kelly.	Glinsky.	43	Ballynakilly.	1680	Callthrapalis.	Dominick Burke, Tit. Bp. of Elphin.	
Edmond Dolan.	Keilcrooa.	44	Aghrim and Killconnel.	1683	Creggeene.	Teige Keogh, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.	

Dudley Gallagher.	Moyrish.	62 Killeny.	1666 Fernes.	Bp. Plunket, Tit.
Morgan Duffy.	Ross.	52 Ross.	1670 Loughrea.	Bp. of Ferns.
Ferragh Kelly.	Ballynekill.	50 Ballynekill in Ere- conought.	1681 Galloway.	Dominick Burke, Tit.
Daniel King.	Ballydoone.	50 Ballindoone.	1674 Oranmore.	Bp. of Elphin.
William Joyce.	Machry- more.	49 Kilcummin.	1674 Do.	James Lynch, Tit.
Daniel Flagherty.	Moynish.	54 Moynish.	1673 Cloonbar.	Bp. of Tuam.
Barthol. Connor.	Drumcong.	38 Muckullin.	1689 Galloway.	Do.
Teige Teernan.	Russcahill.	50 Killanane.	1674 Cloonbar.	Do.
Laughlin Maddin.	Killinane.	45 Killynane and Kil- tornor.	1674 Deareen.	Teige Keogh, Tit.
James Cun- ningham.	Carrownell- key.	38 Killtullagh.	1692 Kilkenny.	Bp. of Clonfert.
Patrick Keaghy.	Isserclarin.	50 Kilcomekny and Lickerick.	1674 Kilconnel.	James Phelan, Tit.
James Maddin.	Meelick.	38 Meelick and Fahy.	1686 Kilkenny.	Bp. of Ossory.
Edward French.	Spidle.	47 Spidle and Seaside.	1681 Ballylooge.	Teige Keogh, Tit.
John Hyne.	Carrowbegg	39 Killchrist, Killinane and Iskerkelly.	1688 Kilkenny.	Bishop of Ossory.
				Teige Keogh, Tit.
				Bishop of Clonfert.
				James Phelan, Tit.
				Bishop of Ossory.

Popish Priests Names.	Place of Abode.	Parishes of which they pre- sided to be Popish Priests.	Year Orders recd.	Places where they received Orders.	From whom they received them.	Sureties Names that entered into Recognizance for such Priests according to the said Act.
John Skerrot.	Cappa- moyle.	45 Abbert.	1684	Salamanca, Spain.	Peter Salafar, Bp. of Salamanca.	
Walter Dillon.	Clonbrook.	53 Fohenough, part of Killgerrill.	1673	Killconnel.	Teige Keogh, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.	
James Hyne.	Ballylee.	50 Killtartan.	1673	Athleague.	Domk. Burke, Tit. Bishop of Elphin.	
Bryan Laughlin.	Tullyry.	50 Kiltomas.	1687	Kilkenny.	James Phelan, Tit. Bishop of Ossory.	
Edmund Lynch.	Clogh.	30 Killower.	1698	Samora, Spain.	Ferdinando Mannell, Fredico, Bp. of Salmora.	
P.k. Ber- mingham.	Ballinduffe.	30 Killcoona.	1695	Salamanca, Spain.	Francis Bodkin, Bish. of Salamanca.	
Richard Betagh.	Gowlagh.	57 Ahasrah and Killyan	1672	Cloonseilan.	Dominick Burke, Tit. Bp. of Elphin.	
Thomas Keaghy.	Larragh.	45 Knockmoy & Derry- mac-cloghny.	1678	Clonkenlagh.	Teige Keogh, Tit. Bishop of Clonfert.	
Patrick Kirwan.	Cahrue.	37 Belclaretuam.	1689	Rome.	John Minetty, Bishop of Sutry.	
John Tully.	Rue.	49 Killora, Killeeny and Killogillin.	1677	Creggeclara.	Andrew Lynch, Tit. Bp. Kilfenora.	
Bryan Burne.	Clohanover.	51 Killeny.	1676	Namure.	Bishop of Namure.	
Andrew Kirwan.	Ardskea- begg.	31 Killmolane.	1697	Kilrickill,	Murtagh Donnellan, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.	
Jon. Cun- cannon.	Barny.	44 Templetogether, part of Boynagh.	1684	Athleague.	Dominick Burke, Tit. Bp. of Elphin.	

Myles Welshe.	Moylagh.	37 Moylagh and Aghy-gart.	1691 Gallway.	James Lynch, Tit. Archbishop of Tuam.
James Betagh.	Knockoran.	52 Killbenut.	1694 Carrichoa.	John Flynn, Titular Bishop of Cork.
Dennis Bryan.	Ballinlass.	50 Killroan.	1675 Athleague.	Dom. Burke, Tit. Bp. of Elphin.
Edmund Burke.	Garrone.	33 Killcrenan.	1697 Ballylooge.	Murtagh Donnellan, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.
Edmund Lyne.	Meelick.	56 Boyanagh.	1676 Cloonbar.	James Lynch, Tit. Arch. Bp. of Tuam.
Teige Kelly.	Killeene.	50 Killcloony.	1681 Creggeene.	Teige Keogh, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.
Edmund Burke.	Curryfirm.	50 Cummer.	1678 Clonkelagh.	Teige Keogh, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.
Jonack Mooney.	Ballyvolane	31 Drumacooe.	1697 Killrickill.	Murtagh Donnellan, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.
John Egan.	Ower.	54 Killorsa.	1676 Curraghbegg, Co. Roscommon.	Dom. Burke, Tit. Bp. of Elphin.
Roger Noone.	Lisnacoaghy.	54 Kilbagnet and Dumramon.	1675 Do.	Dom. Burke, Tit. Bp. of Elphin.
Reginald Quely.	Carrowroe.	50 Killconcerin.	1678 Clonkelagh.	Teige Keogh, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.
George Lovelock.	Lackagh.	45 Lackagh.	1683 Creggeene.	Do.
Owen Reily.	Turlough.	37 Killcroan.	1697 Ballylooge.	Murtagh Donnellan, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.
Teige Donnellan.	Ballyna-ostell.	46 Killcooly.	1683 Creggeene.	Teige Keogh, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.

Popls Priests' Names.	Place of Abode.	2 3 4	Parishes of which they pretend to be Popish Priests.	Year Orders recd.	Places where they received Orders.	From whom they received them.	Sureties Names that entered into Recognizance for such Priests according to the said Act.
Derm. Molan.	Lackty-shaghnullly.	47	Kilmadaugh and Beagh.	1680	Ballylooge.	Teige Keogh, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.	
Thomas Jonyn.	Killymordally.	56	Killymordaly.	1672	Killconnel.	Do.	
Hubbert Burke.	Gredgdoogh.	50	Annaghdoone.	1678	Clonkelagh.	Teige Keogh, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.	
John Bradigan.	Clooncoe.	34	Killkillvery.	1698	Ballylooge.	Murtagh Donnellan, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.	
Denis Hyne.	Killcolgan.	37	Killcolgan.	1691	Galway.	James Lynch, Tit. Archbp. of Tuam.	
John Seahill.	Beaghmore.	50	Donogh-Patrick.	1677	Madrid, Spain.	Do.	
Patrick Kirwan.	Clogher.	46	Liskevoy.	1685	Athleague.	Dominick Burke, Tit. Bp. of Elphin.	
Anthony Hyne.	Carilane.	29	Killiny.	1700	Waterford.	Richard Perse, Tit. Bp. of Waterford.	
Richard Burke.	Tyaquin.	54	Ballynakilly.	1674	Cloonbar.	James Lynch, Tit. Archbp. of Tuam.	
John McKinine.	Killcornane.	40	Stradbally.	1681	Galway.	Do.	
Turlough Hyne.	Poulnegan.	54	Kinvarragh.	1674	Conge.	Do.	
Jn. Fitz-Symons.	Athenree.	43	Athenree.	1685	Kilkenny.	James Phelan, Tit. Bishop of Ossory.	
James Coghlan.	Abbygormackane.	39	Abby Gormackan.	1689	Galway.	James Lynch, Tit. Archbp. of Tuam.	

Coagh Fallen,	Carrowbegg	60 Killrickill.	1670 Cloonbar.	James Lynch, Tit. Archbp. of Tuam.
Bryan Lorean.	Bolane.	50 Bolane.	1679 Ballylooge.	Teige Keogh, Tit. Bishop of Clonfert.
Richard Burke.	Closhroosty.	40 Leytrim and Kill- meen.	1688 Galway.	James Lynch, Tit. Archbp. of Tuam.
Dermot Dolan.	Killoran.	40 Killoran.	1681 Ballylooge.	Teige Keogh, Tit. Bishop of Clonfert.
James Mannine.	Cloon- chinshy.	40 Grange.	1687 Kilkenny.	James Phelan, Tit. Bishop of Ossory.
William Kelly.	Cloonrush.	33 Cloonrush.	1697 Thurles.	Richard Pearse, Tit. Bp. of Waterford.
John Burke	Cloanly.	47 Inishealtragh.	1681 Urbine.	Archbishop of Urbine.
Conner Hydey.	Cladagh.	34 Cloonberne.	1697 Ballylooge.	Murtagh Donnellan, Tit. Bp. of Clonfert.

Com. Tipperary. { A LIST of the Names of the Popish Parish Priests as they are Register'd at a General Sessions of the Peace held for the said County at *Nenagh*, the 11th day of *July*, 1704, and were since Return'd up to the Council Office in *Dublin*, pursuant to a Clause in the late Act of Parliament, Intituled, "*An Act for Registering the Popish Clergy.*"

Popish Priests' Names.	Places of Abode.	Parishes of which they pretend to be Popish Priests.	Year Orders recd.	Places where they received Orders.	From whom they received them.	Sureties Names that entered into Recognisance for such Priests according to the said Act.
Edward Tonnelly.	Clonmel.	50 Clonmel.	1677	Kilkenny.	James Phelane, Tit. Bp. of Ossory.	
William Bourke.	Kilmore.	57 Lismoragh, Donnaghmore, Newchappel, Ballyclerkane, Moorstown kirk, Rathronane, Kiltigane, Ballybaptistigrange.	1670	Lissine.	William Burgett, Tit. Bp. of Cashel.	
Edward Butler.	Redmonds town.	46 Kilgrant.	1685	Cregine.	Thady, Bishop of Clonfert.	
James Butler.	Shanbally.	56 Killcash, KILLSHEELANE & Timpletyny.	1670	Kilkenny.	James Whelane, Tit. Bishop of Ossory.	
William Boulger.	Bleanattine.	57 Grangemocker and Kilmurry.	1670	Do.	Do.	
Daniel Dugan.	Carigneshure.	60 Carigneshure & Newtown.	1666	Paris.	Francis Harlea, Bishop of Paris.	
James Holane.	Carrigistale.	72 Templetenny.	1659	Nants, France.	Robert Barry, Tit. Bishop of Cork.	
Michael Tobin.	Mullane.	60 Killvanacuman, Cloneen, Drangan, Modeshel, Mogo-way, Islikerane.	1668	Perques.	Wil. Petraquerinsis, Bishop of Perques.	
James Hylane.	Reaghill.	36 Ballyshehane and Shaughheene.	1692	Reaghill.	John Brenan, Tit. Archbp. of Cashel.	
Dennis Fogarty.	Knockagh.	38 Caghair, Deregrath, Rossetown, Mortletown.	1695	Carricktohall.	John Slyne, Titular Bishop of Cork.	

Darby	Glankeen.	50	Glankeen and Inch.	1680	Portumny.	Teige Keogh, Bishop of Clonfert.
Dorney.	Emly.	60	Emly.	1672	Portugal.	Fabianus de Rue, Bp. of Cavevady, Indies.
Eustace Brown.	Knockcanaby.	60	Tubrid, Tullahortan, Whitechurch.	1671	Lisseene.	William Burgett, Archbp. of Armagh.
William English.	Fenor.	60	Fenor, Bowlick and Kileonly.	1666	Longford.	Edmond Reyly, Archbp. of Armagh.
Matthew Cahill.	Kinkears.	50	Cullen and Kilcur- nane.	1680	Paris, France.	Francis de Harlea, Archbp. of Paris.
D. Header- man.	Ballydun.	40	Solohodemore and Solohodebegg.	1688	Cashel.	John Brenane, Tit. Bishop of Cashel.
Daniel Davoren.	Athnamedle.	38	Ballymack & Agh-namedle.	1688	Canhors.	Henry Legee, Bishop of Canhors.
James Kearney.	Featherd.	72	Featherd & Racoole.	1666	Roan.	Archbishop of Roan, Normandy.
Bryan M'Daniel.	Shuffry.	61	Templeouterough.	1668	Dublin.	Patrick Medensis, Bishop of Meath.
Francis Ryan.	Muckarky.	40	Muckarky, Ballymuc- reene, Boresteagh, Gata.	1688	Reaghill.	John Brenane, Tit. Archbp. of Cashel.
Tdy. Donoghue.	Killinale.	50	Graistown and Bally- cune.	1680	Bazas.	William, Bishop of Bazas, France.
Roger Kennedy.	Dromcalkin	51	Templederry, Killeenaf, Bally- naslohy, Lattiragh, and part of Aghnamedle.	1676	Kilkenny.	James Whelane, Tit. Bp. of Ossory.
James Daniel.	Abbynes Conaghty.	56	Abbyneslonaghty and Newcastle.	1658	Waterford.	Jno. Brenane, Bp. of Waterford & Lismore
William Hurru.	Ardfinane.	35	Ardfinane, Ballpek- ane, Nedame.	1692	Rehill.	James Brenane, Tit. Archbp. of Cashel.

Popiah Priest's Name	Place of Abode.	54	Parishes of which they pretend to be Popiah Priests.	Year Orders recd.	Places where they received Orders.	From whom they received them.	Secret Names that entered into Recognition for such Priests according to the said Act.
Lawrence Hicky.	Rosshorn.	54	Killoscully, Killoonetty & Templecally.	1673	Roan.	And. Finney, Bp. of Funnebar, France.	
John Dwyer.	Garrymona.	52	Bellachill.	1676	Kilkenny.	James Whelan, Tit. Bishop of Ossory.	
James McKee.	Killmastully.	34	Killmastully.	1695	Cork.	John Slyne, Bishop of Cork.	
Daniel Connel.	Rosshorn.	39	Killnaragh and Killmullane.	1688	Kilkenny.	James Whelan, Bishop of Ossory.	
John Devane.	Masters-town.	74	Knockgraffan, Tullmain & Boytonrath.	1653	Paris.	Nicholas Finch, Bishop of Fernes.	
Thomas Grace.	Killshane.	38	Killshane, Templeene, Templeenry and Cloabullug.	1687	Garryricken.	James Whelan, Bishop of Ossory.	
William Meara.	Ballynreenty.	31	Tipperary, Cordangan, Ironhill, Clonpett, Latter and Brulse.	1695	Cork.	John Slyne, Bishop of Cork.	
William Kelly.	Gragane.	72	Ballingarry, Crochane and Lismalin.	1661	Neerbaue.	Anthony Geoghegan, Bishop of Meath.	
James Fogarty.	Killvelcorish.	79	Drum, Barnane and Kilsitmon.	1650	Paris.	Franciscus de Gondy, Cardinal de Rea.	
William Dwyer.	Dondrom.	50	Ballintemple, Oacterleag, Rabbieina & Kulleide.	1673	Lissine.	William Burgett, Archbp. of Cashel.	
Teige Ryan.	Knockroe.	60	Dunnohill, Kilpatrick Aghroe and Toome.	1671	Do.	Do.	
Gd. Prendergast.	Garranelly.	42	Tullemellane.	1693	Paris.	Francis Harlea, Archbp. of Paris.	
Donogh Carroll.	Curragh.	48	Castletown and Burges.	1679	Kilkenny.	James Whelan, Bp. of Kilkenny.	

James M. Ingowne.	Ballylosky.	48 Arderony, Modereny,	1681 Killene.	Teige Keogh, Bishop of Clonfert.
Val St. Lawrence.	Kilfada.	32 English.	1697 Antwerp.	Emanuel Rodrigud, Bishop of Antwerp.
Edmond Lahy.	Holycross.	56 Holycross & Templebegg.	1672 Lisseene.	William Burgett, Archbp. of Cashel.
Richard Butler.	Gatters-town.	38 Clonculty, Clohor, and Moyliffe.	1686 Kilkenny.	James Whelan, Bishop of Ossory.
Edward Saule.	Cashel.	52 Cashel and St. Patrick's Rock.	1676 Salamanca.	Don. Fr. de Seixas, Bishop Salamanca.
Philip Coleman.	Gortenkellis.	53 Ardmayle, Ballyshehane and Erry.	1675 Lisburne.	Chris. de Almada, Bishop of Martirea.
Jeffery Saul.	Killosly.	51 Killinane, Coolmundry, Peperstown, Everards, Coleman, Newchappel and Ballycleraghane.	1677 Leige.	Maxim. Henricus, App. and Elector of Cologn.
Edward Comeford.	Thurles.	60 Thurles.	1669 Roan.	Andrew Linch, Bishop of Finabore.
James Boyton.	Rahelly.	50 Rahelty and Seyne.	1673 Lissine.	William Burgett, A. B. of Cashel.
Dennis Croe	Ballycrenede.	40 Killgeary, Lатарagh and Templedony.	1695 Paris.	Francis Harlea, Archbishop of Paris.
Malachy Fogarty.	Ballybristly.	49 Loghma and Templeroy.	1669 Dublin.	Patrick Plunkett, Bishop of Meath.
Daniel Bryen	Ballybehy.	34 Monytemple, Templetohy and Kilavinoge.	1693 Namure.	Peter Vandon Pere, Bishop of Namure.
Laughlin Cunane.	Roscrea.	44 Roscrea, Bourney,	1684	James Phelan, Bishop of Ossory.
Anthony Kennedy.	Kilduain.	60 Corbally and Behill. Uskane, Burrisokane and Bellingarry.	1670 Dublin.	Patrick Plunket, Bishop of Meath.

Memorandum—This Priest came out of Antwerp in Flanders.

Popish Priests' Names.	Place of Abode.	No.	Parishes of which they pretend to be Popish Priests.	Year Orders read.	Places where they received Orders.	From whom they received them.	Sureties Names that entered into Recognisance for such Priests according to the said Act.
Donough Kennedy.	Glanbuoin.	60	Kilbarron, Cloghpri- ora and Terryglass.	1668	Dublin.	Patrick Plunket, Bishop of Meath.	
Darby Birhagra.	Rathduff.	40	Relligmurry.	1688		James Phelan, Bishop of Ossory.	
Philip Hogan.	Annabeg.	60	Monsea, Kereigh and Killodierne.	1668	Do.	Patrick Plunket, Bishop of Meath.	
Adam Magrath.	Gurteen.	52	Lerha.	1670		Oliver Plunket, Primate of Ireland.	
Donnogh Kennedy.	Killmore.	59	Nenagh, Kilmore and Dolla.	1668	Do.	Patrick Plunket, Bishop of Meath.	
James Glissane.	Killanane.	28	Lisbunny.	1701	Cork.	John Slyne, Bishop of Cork.	
Daniel Agan.	Bally- macagan.	45	Dorha.	1680	Ballylogg.	Teige Keogh, Bishop of Clonfert.	
Dennis Kennedy.	Gurteen.	27	Finnogh.	1701	Cork.	John Slyne, Bishop of Cork.	
Connor Guilfoyle.	Aghall.	31	Templemore, Temple- rye and Killea.	1698	Sanctama, Flan- ders.	John Longuevill, A.B. of Cambrey.	
Morrish Fitzgerald.	Cranagh.		Templetnoghy.	1675	Rome.	Cardinal Vicario.	
Luke White.	Clonmel.	67	Clonmel.	1656	Nants, France.	Robert Barry, Bp. of Cork Cloyne.	

APPENDIX II.

THE IRISH CHURCH MISSIONS.

THE date of the last letter which appears in the Complete Correspondence on the above subject, is the 19th of February, 1864. The following letter from Rev. Mr. Webster, one of the principals in the Correspondence, is dated the 26th of March of the same year, five full weeks later, so that the "Copy of the Complete Correspondence" may have been printed off when it appeared, or perhaps Rev. Mr. Webster regarded it as not strictly a part of the controversy in which he had been engaged, as it is chiefly an answer to the criticisms of those who attacked him for the principles he had put forward in that controversy. In any case it is well worth preserving for its own intrinsic value, and because it makes the Correspondence more complete.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CORK CONSTITUTION.

SIR—In this morning's impression of your paper a speech of the Rev. Canon M'Neile appears in behalf of the Irish Church Missions. This speech was made at a public meeting in Hope Hall, Liverpool, on the 21st March, and a gentleman in Dublin sent me this morning a copy of it, cut out of the *Evening Mail*. In the copy now in my possession some passages, it would appear, were omitted by you; and although they allude so sharply to my conduct, I am sorry the public in Cork have not had the advantage of reading them. No person will suppose I can take pleasure in hearing or reading gross misrepresentations of my conduct; and, therefore, I should ask, in future, if ever you think it worth your while to copy into your paper from other journals any attack upon me,* you will be good enough to copy the whole documents. My friends in Cork will thus be enabled to see how unscrupulous, in some instances, are these attacks, and how hard it is for an honest man to cope with those who suppress the truth wilfully, or who can stand by and hear the most serious mistakes made by others without correcting such mistakes. One of the passages in the Rev. Canon M'Neile's speech to which I am alluding, and which you have omitted in the *Constitution*, is the following:—"He (Mr Webster) insinuates that he could tell what he does not tell. He has been asked to do it, and has not done

* We are not likely to do this. In the present instance we copied none of the attack, but purposely expunged it.—*En. Constitution*.

it. I hope no Englishman will listen to such calumny, or allow any damage to be done to a society like this by listening to insinuations not endorsed manfully and boldly by him who brings them forward." It appears from the report that the Rev. H. C. Eade was present when these statements were made, and that Mr. Eade himself made a speech at the same meeting. The mistake made by Canon M'Neile is similar to the mistake made by many others, and I can account for it only upon one supposition that would allow me to call it a mere mistake. The Irish Church Missions thought proper to publish a pamphlet containing only a part of my correspondence, and omitting just that part in which I brought forward some, but I submit, quite sufficient proof of all the charges I had alleged. If what I have already published as my proofs be deemed by the Irish Church Missions insufficient, let some officer of the society plainly say so, and then I shall be quite willing to submit some other documentary evidence to the public. But so far the Irish Church Missions have not impugned the veracity of my witnesses. I am aware the Irish Church Missions have within the last few days published a pamphlet containing the correspondence in full, but this was not done until four rectors were obliged to edit and publish what they were forced to call "the only complete copy of the correspondence," &c., and to complain, as they do in their preface, of the unfairness of the Irish Church Missions. I do not ask you or any one else to become my advocate, but I do ask all who love truth, and who take the slightest interest in the present controversy, to read this pamphlet, edited by four rectors, in which all Mr. Eade's letters appear, all Mr. Dallas's, together with a Paper on Conscience by Mr. Dallas, and Mr. Colquhoun's letter to the *Daily Telegraph*. I have said that Canon M'Neile's mistake is similar to the mistake made by many others—that of supposing that I declined to give any proof of the charges I made against the society—the gravest charge of all being that of bribery. Let me give you one or two specimens of the language used by some of your contemporaries. The *Christian Examiner*, March 9th, 1864 :—"Mr. Webster, no doubt, fully comprehends the meaning of the word dastardly. It means an attempt at mischief under the control of fear. Suppose, as is probable, that Mr. Webster was acquainted with a lady whose position was one of the highest respectability, and whose character was without reproach, and whose recognised position in society placed her above the reach of taint or stain. What would Mr. Webster think of one who would come to him and say, 'I could tell you of things, of facts, of persons, of places—I could tell you of instances of what I saw and heard, that would leave this lady's honour and reputation not worth a straw?' Would not Mr. Webster, as a man of honour, if he had the feelings of a man at all, demand the particulars? Would he in his own mind, or perhaps with his own mouth, condemn the lady on the ground of what the informer could tell him—only he was afraid! * * * * What does he mean by saying he could tell when he does not tell,

but shrinks, from whatever cause, to verify calumnies, which must remain calumnies, until he names person, time, and place? This is dastardliness, in the fullest sense of the phrase; and such as it is we are constrained to lay it at the door of 'the Protestant Chancellor of Cork!' * * * * The most daring and outrageous falsehood, perhaps, in this 'argumentative letter' is Mr. Webster's statement—that he 'could give,' but dares not, 'instances where the ordained agents of the Irish Church Missions paid Protestants to pretend they were Roman Catholics at the controversial meetings, and at these meetings to call these very ordained agents the hardest names.' This foulest of all slanders defies comment. No words could convey, in at all adequate language, what this infamous aspersion deserves. Its baseness can only be equalled by its utter absurdity. * * * * By all means, let Mr. Eade confess that bread and clothes are given to children and adults for the very and express purpose of bringing them to the Irish Church Mission Schools. Let the society glory in it, notwithstanding the squeamish prudery of the Protestant Chancellor. * * * * We advise Mr. Eade, however, to plead guilty, and we advise the society to do the same, through its representatives, as we think there is rather a high and illustrious precedent for the sin of bribery and corruption, in this peculiar form of administering temporal relief along with spiritual instruction and enlightenment." Then the *Carlow Sentinel* writes (March 12):—"Whether Mr. Webster is merely a tool in the hands of those who plot against the Establishment (with a view, perhaps, to reversion rather than subversion) or whether he be himself a worker for its ruin, it is not our present purpose to inquire. We have ourselves a decided opinion upon the merits of the general question, which opinion is, that so far as the Society for Irish Church Missions is concerned, Mr. Webster occupies towards it the position of a libeller, and we charitably trust a sincere one." The *Achill Missionary Herald*, March 15th, writes:—"In our last number we described Mr. Webster's attack upon the Society for Irish Church Missions as 'silly and spiteful.' He puts forth charges affecting the characters of clergymen and others, and when called upon to name the individuals referred to, he is unable to do so, covering his retreat from this reasonable demand by the pretence that he is 'unwilling to allow the controversy to degenerate from a great war of principles into a series of petty squabbles about the folly or dishonesty of this individual or that.' He arraigned the Society for Irish Church Missions through the medium of his pulpit at the bar of public opinion; and when called upon to substantiate his charges he is obliged, so far as facts are concerned, to submit to the humiliation of a non-suit. * * * Unable to sustain his indictment of the Society for Irish Church Missions by facts. * * * These are only a few out of many specimens that might be quoted of the effect produced by the Irish Church Missions by publishing their first pamphlet. I cannot believe that the editors of these journals ever read my letter to the *Constitution*, dated February 15th, in

which, after many efforts to screen the scandal, I was compelled in self-defence to adduce some of my proofs of all that I had advanced. That letter, of course, did not appear in the pamphlet published by the Irish Church Missions; and I cannot say too much of the disadvantage to which I was put by the society by such an omission. As I said before, the whole correspondence is now published, and charity makes me believe that neither Canon M'Neile nor the various editors who have done me such injustice ever had the opportunity of reading the whole. Canon M'Neile quotes a passage from Archbishop Whately which appears in Mr. Dallas's paper on Conscience. To me it is simply amusing to hear such a writer quoted, as if anything he ever said or wrote could be supposed by any honest man to advocate the practice of bribery. As Canon M'Neile refers to the "Lessons on Morals," perhaps he never had his attention directed to what the Archbishop says in the eighth chapter of that very book, section 1:—

"CONSCIENCE NEVER TO BE OPPOSED.—You have seen that as man's conscience is not infallible, you must not at once conclude that you are right when you are acting according to the dictates of conscience. And yet you may be sure that you are wrong if you are acting against it. For if you do what you believe to be wrong, even though you may be mistaken in thinking so, and it may be in reality right, still you yourself will be wrong. And this is what the Apostle Paul means when he says, 'Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth'—(Rom. xiv. 22); and 'Whatsoever is not of faith is sin'—that is, whatsoever is not done with a full conviction (faith) that it is allowable, is to him sinful, and he condemns himself in doing it. And on this principle he alludes (in 1 Cor. x.) to the case of some of the 'weaker brethren' [the less intelligent] among the early Christian converts who thought that the flesh of an animal which had been offered in sacrifice to idols was unclean, and not to be eaten. He does not at all himself partake of the scruple, considering it a matter of no consequence, in a religious or moral point of view, what kind of food a man eats. But he teaches that those who do feel such a scruple would be wrong in eating that flesh, and 'their conscience being weak is defiled, for to him who thinketh it unclean to him it is unclean.' And he teaches also that it would be wrong for any one to induce others to do what they think sinful, though it be something that is not sinful to one who does not think it so. In such a case as this both parties are acting rightly if the one eats what he is convinced is allowable, and the other abstains from what he thinks is not allowable, provided always that neither of them uncharitably censures or derides his neighbour. 'Let not him that eateth,' says Paul, 'despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth;' and 'let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.'—Rom. xiv. 5."

Perhaps, too, Canon M'Neile is not familiar with a passage from

Arnold's "Christian Life," which the late Archbishop used to say ought to be written in letters of gold, and which is quoted in many of his Grace's works. In his Grace's charge, delivered Sept. 22nd, 1848, we have the following words:—"Truth should indeed be earnestly recommended, but recommended as truth; and error censured, because it is error, without any appeal to men's temporal wants, and sufferings, and interests, or to any other such motives as ought not in such a question to be allowed to operate. In the words of my lamented friend, Dr. Arnold—words as true, and as important to be laid to heart, as ever were penned by uninspired man—"The highest truth, if professed by one who believes it not in his heart, is, to him, a lie, and he sins greatly by professing it. Let us try as much as we will to convince our neighbours, but let us beware of influencing their conduct, when we fail in influencing their convictions. He who bribes or frightens his neighbour into doing an act which no good man would do for reward, or from fear, is tempting his neighbour to sin; he is assisting to lower and to harden his conscience—to make him act for the favour or from the fear of man, instead of for the favour or from the fear of God; and if this be a sin in him, it is a double sin in us to tempt him to it." For the purpose of saving the name of Archbishop Whately from the charge of approving of anything that could be called bribery, let me refer Canon M'Neile to another passage in one of his Grace's works, "Lessons on Mind," chap. xxiv., p. 5:—"Conscience is the rightful supreme ruler over the whole man—over all actions, words, and thoughts. That is, nothing can be right which conscience condemns, even though the condemnation be a mistaken one. And this is the meaning of the Apostle, who says, 'Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind; * * * whatever is not of faith (*i.e.*, whatever is not done in a full belief of its being allowable) is sin.'" What Mr. Dallas and Canon M'Neile can mean by quoting Archbishop Whately I cannot tell. I might copy hundreds of passages from his Grace's works to prove that his Grace always taught precisely what appears in the quotations I have now made; and I should most earnestly recommend everybody to read, especially, the book noticed by Mr. Dallas and Canon M'Neile—the "Lessons on Morals." Canon M'Neile says:—"I would take the liberty of saying to the Rev. George Webster that we have no regard whatever to that argument of his, for we know that conscience is a blind guide unless it is enlightened by the word of God;" and therefore, of course, that we may be justified in acting against our conscience. Indeed, Mr. Dallas says expressly that St. Peter acted "against his conscience" when, in obedience to the Heavenly Vision and the direct command of God, he went to visit Cornelius! This is Mr. Dallas's opinion, although Holy Scripture tells us expressly that St. Peter was to go "nothing doubting"—"fully persuaded in his own mind," as St. Paul would express it. I have to ask your pardon for this very long letter, and again to say that I am quite willing to abide by the judg-

ment of any honest man who will be content to read "the only complete copy of the whole correspondence, &c.," edited by Four Rectors and published by Messrs Hodges and Smith.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

GEORGE WEBSTER,

Chancellor of Cork and Rector of St. Nicholas.

Cork, March 26th, 1864.

The statements referred to by Mr. Webster we omitted in the report in the *Constitution* because some of them were untrue, and because we did not wish to give occasion for a reply. We have called them untrue, and being untrue, how came they to be made? How came Dr. M'Neile to be ignorant that the correspondence did not cease on the 23rd of February, and that what Mr. Webster said he'd do he did? How came Dr. M'Neile to be ignorant of this? How came he to know anything about the correspondence if he didn't know all; and how came Mr. Eade to sit by approvingly, instead of rising and saying—"The Rev. Chairman is mistaken; Mr. Webster performed what he promised, offered me even the names of the delinquents if I chose to publish them, but I, instead of accepting the offer, thought it prudent to decline"—how came Mr. Eade to do this? Does he imagine that the society is served by his silence, and if he does, does he imagine that silence is a service which, under such circumstances, a society should accept? We put these questions, not that we agree with Mr. Webster (for we should have no hesitation in giving a breakfast to little ones, Romanist or Protestant, Greek, Mahommedan, or Jew, who could get no breakfast elsewhere in time to attend a school), but that we disagree with Mr. Eade—that we detest deception and dishonesty, and look on suppression and perversion as dishonouring to the Christian cause. The course from the first would be to say—"We accept your testimony, Mr. Webster. We are constrained to believe that there have been improprieties—iniquitous improprieties on the part of the agent or agents you undertake to name; but eight years have passed, and the transgressors are either no longer in the country or not under our control. If you know of anything similar at present we will thank you to tell us of it, and inquiry shall be at once made; but as to the food, we differ from you there. You think it bribery—we do not; and, confident in the integrity of our intentions, we proclaim publicly that it is our purpose to continue it; and will leave the public to decide between us." Such a declaration would have saved all controversy, and spared us the necessity of employing our columns in the correction of misstatements for which there is no excuse. Dr. M'Neile we do not blame, for had he seen the correspondence he would not have spoken as he did; but we blame those who, if they informed him at all, should have informed him rightly, or who made themselves parties to the misstatements by suffering the meeting to disperse under the

false impressions they produced. There are two guineas announced "as a response to Mr. Eade's speech." It would be far more creditable to that gentleman if there had been a few words from him to put the facts properly before the responder. If there were such words, and that they were unfortunately omitted in the report, we shall be most happy, at Mr. Eade's request, to supply them. If there were not such words, it would be better either to hold no meetings, or to refrain from statements which require contradiction. As things stand, the friends of the Mission—we mean those (and they are many) who in sincerity believe it a good work—have great reason to be dissatisfied; they would renounce it for ever rather than be held responsible for statements of which Mr. Eade should not have been an assentient auditor. We write warmly, for the better a cause is, the more every honest man should be set against reprehensible means for advancing it, and its supporters have a right to be indignant when statements are made of it before ignorant audiences—audiences ignorant of the facts which are unwarrantably (though by the individual undesignedly) distorted.—*Editor of Constitution.*

APPENDIX III.

THE PASSAGE FROM ARCHBISHOP WHATELY'S CHARGE REFERRED TO IN
PAGE 531.

When at page 531, the Author gave the substance of a passage from one of Archbishop Whately's Charges, he was unable to quote the words in full, although most desirous to do so, inasmuch as the copy of the charge which he at one time possessed, had been lost. That being so, he could only reproduce a short note giving the substance of it, which he made shortly after the Charge was published. He is now happy to say, that within the last few days he has been fortunate enough to obtain the Charge in which the passage occurs. It is as follows :—

“The conversions to Romanism, of late years, especially in England, though a very insignificant number, compared with the whole mass of the population, yet have far exceeded anything that can be remembered by the present generation, or by the preceding. And the number of recent conversions to our Church, in this island, is very much greater still. It has often been remarked that these latter have taken place chiefly among the humbler classes of society ; and that, on the other hand, the secessions to the Church of Rome have been chiefly among the Gentry and the Clergy. And a stranger might be disposed, at the first glance, to consider this as forming a presumption, that education and intelligence are favourable to the cause of Rome, and that comparative ignorance and scanty intellectual culture, predispose men to the reception of Protestant views. But, on closer inquiry, he would find that those of the educated classes who have embraced Romanism, have done so, for the most part, by their own admission, not from investigation of evidence, and on grounds of rational conviction, but by deliberately giving themselves up to the guidance of feeling and imagination. Argumentative powers, indeed, and learning, several of them possess in a high degree ; but these advantages they think themselves bound to lay aside and to disparage, in all that pertains to religion. Though well qualified, by nature and education, to weigh evidence, either for the truth of Christianity generally, or of any particular doctrines, and place the virtue of faith in a ready reception of what a man is told, and which is congenial to his own sentiments, without any more reason for the hope that is in him' than the Pagans have for their belief. They are led, and consider it right to be led, by a craving for the beautiful, the touching, the splendid, and the picturesque. They

deliberately prefer what will afford the most scope for the exercise of their feelings, and the gratification of fancy, and they have joined the Church which best supplies what they desire.

"I am not, you will observe, casting any imputation on the sincerity of their belief of what they profess. The question is not as to the reality of their conviction, but as to the grounds of it. Of course when a man has once resolved, through the operation of any kind of bias, to adopt a certain system, he will be likely, afterwards, to seek for plausible arguments to justify, both to others and to himself, the course taken; and may, perhaps, end by believing, and making others believe, that these arguments were the cause of his decision, when, in truth, they are rather the effect of it. And though it is not allowable to impute to anyone, without proof, such a bias, even when there may be reason to suspect it,—on the other hand, when anyone acknowledges himself to have been thus biassed, there can be nothing rash or unfair in attributing his decision to that cause.

"All the deference, therefore, which might be due to any one's learning or intelligence, must evidently be cast aside, when he is confessedly making his religious faith a matter of mere feeling and taste. All his superiority of reasoning-powers goes for nothing, in a case where he has repudiated the use of reason; even as the most clear-sighted and the most dim-sighted are on a level, when both are led blindfold.

"The humblest peasants, therefore, who have set themselves seriously to inquire, not for what is the most acceptable to their taste, but for what is true, and who have carefully examined and reflected, according to the best of the powers God has given them,—these are evidently bearing far stronger testimony in favour of the faith they adopt, than even ten times as many of the most intelligent and best informed of the human race, who shall have resolved to abstain from all rational inquiry, and all careful reflection, and to give themselves up to the guidance of their feelings."—*Charge delivered at the Triennial Visitation of the Province of Dublin in the year 1853, by Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin, p. 6, et seq.*

The Author does not think it necessary to make any observations on the elaborate sophistry of the above passage; but he may be allowed to say, that, in the short summary of it in page 531, its gist is correctly given.

INDEX.

Albrizzi's letter, 288.
 Achill Island, Proselytism, 524 *et seq.*
 —Money expended there, 527.
 Adventurers, 402-3-4, *et seq.*, 408-9.
 Allen, Archbishop of Dublin, 2.
 Anne, Queen, 505, (see note), 506—Her
 Penal Laws, 507, *et seq.*—Clauses of
 the Act of 1703-4, *et seq.*—Act of
 Explanation, 512.
 Antrim, Earl of, 212, 274.
 Aphorismical Discovery, 129.
 Assembly General, 273.
 Athlone, 486, *et seq.*
 Aughrim, 483.

 Bacon, Lord F. on Ireland (note) 31,
 58 (note).
 Bagenal, Marshal, 18 (note).
 Baltrasna, Castle of, 418.
 Barbadoes, Irish women sent to, 407.
 Barnewall, Sir P., 39.
 Barnwall, Mr. F., racked, 154.
 Benburb, Battle of, 243.
 Bibles and Testaments, number of,
 distributed in Ireland, 523.
 Bible readers, their aggressiveness in
 Kingstown, 549.
 Bird's Nest, the lessons children are
 taught there, 549.
 Billings' reasons for a Cessation, 195.
 Bishops join the Confederation, 170.
 Black Tom, 82.
 Boulter, Primate, 518 (see note.)
 Bourke, Lieut.-General, 174.
 Boyle, Clerk of the Council, 2 (after-
 wards Earl of Cork).
 Boyle, Wentworth's proceedings there,
 87.
 Boyne, Battle of, 479.
 Brandenburghers nearly annihilated,
 483.
 Brereton, Sir W., 201.
 Bribery, 443.
 Broghill, Lord, 351.
 Brounker, Sir H., 35, 39, *et seq.*
 Buckingham, 74.
 Butlers, the two, 1—Brown, George, 1,
 et seq., 91.

Capel, Lord, speech on opening Par-
 liament, 19th August, 1695, 495—
 Catholics excluded from it by an
English statute, ib.—Laws against
 Catholics enacted in it, *ib. et seq.*
 Carlyle, Thos., on the sack of Drogheda,
 335.
 Carte, Ormonde's biographer, 286.
 Cashel, taking of, 157.
 Castleconnell, 375-6.
 Castlehaven, 140, 211-12-13, 344-8,
 378.
 Catholic Churches seized, 80.
 Catholics, 219, 221, 428-9—Schemes
 for excluding them from Parliament,
 437, 438.
 Cavaliers, 425.
 Cessation, 192, *et seq.*—Concluded, 198,
 200—Violated, 206, 209.
 Charles I., 74, 93, 127, 171, 177, *et seq.*,
 204, 213-16-17, 232-3, 256, 265.—
 His death, 292.
 Charlemont, Lord (Sir Toby Caulfield)
 shot, 126.
 Charlemont, Fort of, 172.
 Charter Schools, 521.
 Chichester, Sir A., 38, 40, 45—Grant
 of Inishowen, 46 (note), 68, 97, 417-
 418.
 Clanrickard, Lord, 159, 160, 175, 222,
 256-9, 260, 275, 283, 381-2, 399.
 Clonmel, 353-4, *et seq.*
 Clonmacnoise, Council of, 370.
 Cole, Sir W., 132.
 Commissioners (King's) 178.
 Commission to Jones, Dean of Kilmore,
 and others, 123, *et seq.*
 Confederation, Demands of, 213—New
 Council, 252, 269, 381.
 Confiscations under James I., 73.
 Congregation of Kilkenny, Acts of,
 162-3.
 Connaught, 158—Connaught given to
 the Irish, the reason, 410.
 Connolly, Owen, 209.
 Coote, Sir C., 141, 144, 363-4, 382-3.
 Cork, Earl of, 70.
 Cork, Protestant Bishop of, 33.

- Covenants, Scotch, 205, *et seq.*, 210.
 Covenant, taking of it, 106.
 Covenanters, 105 (note.)
 Cox, Mischief done by him, 335.
 Crofty, interview at hill of, 143, *et seq.*
 Cromwell, Oliver, his life and character, 306, 325, *et seq.*—Before Drogheda, 327-8—Quarter or no quarter, 329, 331, *et seq.*—God did it all, 333, 338-9, 342-3, *et seq.*—Siege of Clonmel, 352-4-8, 360, 398, *et seq.*—His death, 424.
 Cromwell, Richard, 424.
 Cromwell, Henry, 424.
 Cromwellians, their conduct at the Restoration, 427, 432.

 Dallas, Mr., 528.
 Davys, Sir John, 34.
 Delegates, 78.
 Desmond, Earl of, 8, *et seq.*—23 (note).
 Desmond, young Earl of, 19, 21.
 Deveny, Bishop, 67.
 Digby, Lord, 202, 229, 230-5-6, 256-7-8-9, 260-7.
 Digby, Sir Kenelm, 237.
 Dillon, Chief Justice, 27.
 Dillon, Lord, left by Ormonde at Finglas, Dublin, 253-4.
 Dingle proselytisers, 531, *et seq.*
 Discoverers, 513-514.
 Double Ordinance, 154.
 Dowdall, Archbishop, 5.
 Dowdall, Edward, 143.
 Drogheda, 327, *et seq.*—Indiscriminate slaughter, 333.
 Drury, Sir W., 19.
 Dublin Castle, projected attack on, 111.
 Duleek, 479.
 Dungan's Hill, Battle of, 253, 269.

 Eade, Rev. Mr., 546.
 Ecclesiastical dues exacted by Protestant clergy, 76 (note).
 Edge hill, battle of, 404.
 Edward VI., 91.
 Egan, Father, 245—Disposition of O'Neill's Forces, 245—Result, 247-8.
 Egan, Right Rev. Dr., Bishop of Ross, 351 (see note).
 Elizabeth—Her Parliament of 1589-60, 6, *et seq.*, 92.
 Embassy to France, 274.
 English Invasion, 101.
 Excommunication removed, 238—Had been drawn up at Jamestown, 368.

 Fairfax, Sir Thomas—He declines the chief command of the army against Scotland, 361-2.

 Faith and Fatherland, 102.
 Falkland, Lord Deputy, 74, 78, 79.
 Famine of 1847, 553.
 Ferboe, Pass of, 379.
 Fennell, 212, 353-4, 386-8, *et seq.*
 Finglass, 479.
 Fines for not attending Protestant service, 36.
 Fitton, 13.
 Flag of Irish Catholic Faith, 2.
 Fleming, Most Rev. Dr., 217.
 Fleming, Baron of Slane, 27.
 Forbes, Dr.—His memorandums made in Ireland, 533, *et seq.*, 550.
 Fosterage, 112 (note).
 Franciscan Fathers, 340.
 Franciscan Church, Cook Street, High Mass there, stopped by Archbishop Loftus and a file of soldiers, 80.
 French, Right Rev. Dr., 340.
 Friars, 81 (note).
 Froude, Mr., on Hugh O'Neill—His adroitness, 15.

 Galway—Wentworth's proceedings there, 89.
 Galway surrenders, 401, 490.
 Generals, appointment of, 168-9.
 George I.—Penal laws passed in his reign, 516.
 George II.—Elective Franchise taken from the Catholics in his reign, 517.
 Ginkle, De, arrives at Limerick, 490.
 Glamorgan, 224-6-7—(Private treaty) 228, 230-1-2-4-6.
 Golden Fort, slaughter there, 25.
 Goodwin and Reynolds, 177.
 Gookin, N.—His opinion of the transplanting, 410.
 Gormanston, Lord, 39—His cabinet captured, 102, 144, *et seq.*
 Grants not enrolled, 56.
 "Graces," The, 75, *et seq.*, 135, 175.
 Grey, Lord Deputy, 26.

 Halifax, 475.
 Hamilton, Colonel, 474.
 Hanna, Rev. Dr., of Belfast, 551, *et seq.*
 Henry, VIII., 91.
 Hewson, Colonel, goes south—His proclamation, 348.
 Herrings for the army, 193.
 Hogan, Galloping, 482 (note).
 Howard's Popery Cases, 515.
 Howard the philanthropist, 522.

 Inchiquin, 99, 173 (note), 174, 200, 271-2-8-9, 280, 296, 337, 343, 351.
 Innocent papists—Who were they? 439—See note, 440, 444.

- Innocent X., Pope, sent the Missionaries of St. Vincent de Paul to Ireland—Reception of Rinuccini, 287.
- Ireland, Protestant misrepresentation about its condition before 1641, 96.
- Ireton—His failure at Duncannon fort, 341—Before Limerick, 375-6, *et seq.*—384, 385, 386 (note)—Persons excepted from treaty by Ireton, 390, 392, 402.
- I.P. *not* I.R.—The dreadful letters I.P. = Irish Papist. — I.R. = Irish rebel, 423.
- Irish Church Missions to the Roman Catholics, 528—In Belfast, 550—A sham Catholic champion there, *ib.*, 551—The Church Missions made no really instructed Protestant converts, 553—Annual subscriptions, 554.
- "Irish enemy," 101.
- Irish Confederation, 175, *et seq.*
- Irish Guides at Baggottrath unjustly blamed (one being a priest), 299.
- Irish, Extermination of, 402-3—Toleration of, 409—Protected with a vengeance, 421.
- Israelites in Exile, 108.
- Island Magee, 115, *et seq.*—124, *et seq.* (see note).
- Jamestown, Congregation at, 367-8.
- James II., 451—Manifests his Catholicity, *ib.*—His anomalous position, 452—Protestant ideas of Catholic religion, *ib.*—Episcopalians, 453.—Proclamation, 454—C. J. Fox's opinion, 454 (see note), 456—James flies from England, 457—Archbishop King's State of the Protestants, *ib.*, *et seq.*—His love of liberty, 458—Dissenters get relief by taking oaths against Popery, 459—Bishops Burnet and Mant, 460—King James leaves Ireland, 467-9—Lands in Kinsale, 474.
- James I., 33, 41, 51, 54, 56, 57, 73, 93, 97, 98.
- Jones, Sir R., governor of Connaught, 159.
- Jones, Colonel Michael, 294, 340.
- Jones, Archbishop of Dublin, 99.
- Judgment, The, of divers Archbishops, 74.
- Julianstown Bridge, 141.
- Justices, Lords, 113, 133, 134.
- Kane, Rev. Dr., of Belfast, 551 *et seq.*
- Kells, Synod of, 161.
- Kildare, Earls of, 60 *et seq.*, 71.
- Kildare, G., 16th Earl of, 142 (note).
- Kildare, 4th Earl of, his speech to the Lord Deputy, 67.
- Kildare, Countess of, 254 (note).
- Kilkenny, march on, 248—Surrendered to Cromwell, 349—Profanation of the churches, 349-50.
- Kilkea, 254.
- Kilmallock, 21.
- King, Archbishop of Dublin, 457, *et seq.*
- Knox, Andrew, Bishop of Raphoe, 67, 98 (note).
- Lambert, 325.
- Lawrence, Colonel, 410.
- Leland, Dr., 102, 123, 209.
- Leslie's Answer to King, 466—His estimate of James's character, 463, 468.
- Leslie, General, his correspondence with Owen Roe, 172.
- Levellers, 325.
- Limerick City of, 379—Divisions in Limerick, 386—Battle at the breach, 483—Surrenders, 491—Treaty of, *ib. et seq.*, 498-9.
- Lindsay, Barnet, 121.
- Lisle, Lord, 180, 185 (note).
- Liturgy (Protestant) forbidden by Puritans to be used, 267.
- Livery to sue, Catholics deprived of it, 8.
- Loftus, Adam, Chancellor and Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, 80.
- Lords Justices, 80, 113, 123, 127, 131, 136, *et seq.*, 139, 146, 148, 152, *et seq.*, 160, 177, 197.
- Lorraine, Duke of, 399.
- Louis XIV. crosses the Rhine with an army, and overrun Holland, 503, *et seq.*—(see note).
- Ludlow, General, 375-7, 380.
- Magrath, Father Myler, 361.
- Maguire, Rory, (note) 117.
- Magrath, Miler, 321.
- Mandates, Royal, 37.
- Marlborough invests Cork, 484.
- Martyrs, The forty, 553.
- Martyrs, 24.
- Mary, her rule in Ireland, 5, 91.
- Mass, The, 417.
- M'Mahon, Heber, Bishop of Clogher, 274, 363.
- M'Mahon, Colonel, 111, 153.
- M'Phelim, Hugh, 184.
- Monk, 294—His soldiers desert him, 295—His career—His character—He restores Charles II., 425-6.

- Monroe, General Robert, 129, 210, 211, 243, 251.
- Montrose—His defeat—Ignored by Charles II. after it, 365.
- Moore, Lady Alice, 221.
- Moore, young Lord, 222.
- Moore, Father and companions, 26.
- Mountjoy, 14.
- Mountgarret, 157, 168.
- Mulcahy, F. Nicholas, P.P., of Ard-
finan, 361.
- Munster, 155, 158.
- Muskerry, Lord, 272-5.
- Nantwick, battle of, 201.
- Napoleon I., a principle of his, 441
- New Testaments sent to the Author.
523.
- Nobles or Nob's, to bring to ninepence,
359 (note).
- Nominees, favours to, 435.
- Number killed in the Rising of 1641,
117, *et seq.*
- Oath of Association, 165-6-7.
- Oblivion and Indemnity, Act of, 430—
for Ireland—for Scotland, *ib.*
- O'Brien, Murrrough, 270.
- O'Byrnes, their case, 55.
- O'Callaghan, Friar, 287.
- O'Connolly, or O'Connolly, Owen, 112,
113 (*and note*), 209.
- O'Connor, Dr. Chas., 31.
- O'Daly, 69.
- O'Devany, Archbishop, 418.
- O'Donnell, 41.
- O'Farrell, Lieut.-General, 345.
- Officers, the forty-nine, 445.
- O'Haly, Right Rev. Dr., 24.
- O'Hurley, Most Rev. D., 26, *et seq.*
- O'Moore, Roger, 108, 109 — Dinner
party, 109, *et seq.*, 145.
- O'Neill, Hugh, jun., called *Duff*, 354, *et
seq.*, (see note also), 384-5.
- O'Neill, Henry, Owen Roe's son, 363,
392-3.
- O'Neill, McTully, 249.
- O'Neill, Sir Phelim, 126—See note on
death of Lord Charlemont, *ib.*, 127,
129, 130.
- O'Neill, Hugh, 15, *et seq.*, 23, 41.
- O'Neilan, Father D., 26.
- O'NEILL, OWEN ROE, his landing, 130,
161, 172, 198, 243, 250-7-8, 261, 272,
281-2-3—Deserted by half of his
army, 292, 293, *et seq.*, 302, *et seq.*—
His death, 304, 362—His character
as a General, 406 (note).
- O'Reilly, Father James, 360.
- O'Reilly, Most Rev. Hugh, Primate,
161.
- Ormonde, Duke of, 9, 71, 72, 86, 148, *et
seq.*, 187, *et seq.*, 202, *et seq.*, 218, 220,
222-3-4-5, 236, 238—Peace of the
General Assembly with him called
Peace of 1646, 242, 251-5-6, 258-9,
261-2 — His humiliation, *ib.*, 264-5
—King's letter to him, 266-7-8, 270,
1-2, 274-5-7, 285-6-9, 290, *et seq.*—
At Ballysonan, 302, 325, 337, 342,
345-6-7, 369, 370, 372, *et seq.*—Goes
to France, 381, 386-7, 444-5.
- Ormonde, James, second and last Duke
of, 507 (note).
- O'Rourke, Brian-na-murtha, 29.
- O'Rourke, Rev. C., 24.
- Ossory, Earl of, 1.
- Ossory, P. Bishop of, 34.
- O'Sullivan, 66, 69.
- Pale, English, 101, 136, 142, 150, *et
seq.*, 158.
- Parliament, Puritan, 208—Commis-
sioners' articles with Ormonde,
263.
- Parliament of 1613, 44, *et seq.*—of
1634, 83, *et seq.*—of 1661, 436.
- Parsons, 55.
- Peace, the Roman, 237.
- Peace of 1646, 238-9, 240-1.
- Peisley, Capt., his barbarities, 156.
- Penal Laws enforced at the Restora-
tion, 431, 497 (see note)—School-
masters, 513—Bishops and Priests,
513.
- Perrot, Lord Deputy, 29.
- Petty, Sir W.—His witnesses, 444.
- Plans for Rising of 1641, 110, *et seq.*
- Plantation of Munster, 11.
- Plantation of Ireland, new, 408.
- Plunket, Most Rev. Oliver, Primate
of Ireland, 446, *et seq.*—Chief accus-
ers were unworthy priests, M'Moyer,
Duffy, Murphy, 447, *et seq.*—Trial
transferred to London, 449—Tried
and condemned before his witnesses
had arrived, *ib.*—His defence, *ib.*—
His reliques brought to Germany.
ib.—See note for Protestant testi-
mony in favour of Dr. Plunket.
- Plunket, Sir R., 109.
- Portadown, Slaughter and Appari-
tions there, 122, (note).
- Precincts, Division into, 422.
- Prendergast, J. P.—His letter to the
Author, (note) 429.
- Presbyterians of Ulster, 422.
- Preston, 184—Loses his army, 251,
256-8, 261, 275, 281, 336.

- Priest Hunters, 417—Various plans for discovering priests, *ib.*
 Priests, Proclamation against them, 54, 99—Declared guilty of high treason, 418.
 Priests always outlaws, 416—Spenser's opinion of them, *ib.*
 Proselytizing Education, 518, *et seq.*
 Protectorates, 273.
 Protestant Ascendancy, 45, 446.
 Protestant Reformation, 94.
 Protestants, Demands of, 215-16.
 Protestant Strangers invited to settle in Ireland, 493.
 Purcell—His unaccountable delay in reaching Baginbun, 299.
 Puritans—Their hatred of the Mass, 104—Length of their sermons, their inspirations, &c., 105, (note). 106, (note)—Blasphemy against God, 268.
 Queen Henrietta, 274-5—Her letter to her husband, 479.
 Rack, The, 152.
 Rathmines, 297—Battle of, 298, *et seq.*—English Officer's account, 301.
 Read, J., 153.
 Rebellion, Alarms of, 438.
 Recusants (Popish), 9.
 Remonstrance from Trim, 185.
 Remonstrance of the English Army, 291.
 Rinuccini (Nuncio), 228, 237, 252, 257-8, 269, 272-3-7-8-9—Excommunication, 280-2-3-4-5—His character, 286-7—Removal of the Excommunication, 288.
 Romans, Ancient, 101.
 Ross, Battle of, 183.
 Sarsfield—His refusal to carry a letter from William to Tyrconnell—His success at Ballyneety, 481-2—He was ignorant of St. Ruth's plans, 489.
 Saxey, Justice, 34.
 Scarampi—He arrives in Ireland, 195.
 Scariff Hollis, Battle of, 363.
 Schomberg, 476-7.
 Scots cross the Tyne and levy heavy contributions in England, 107, 211.
 Settlement, Act of: its disingenuousness, 432, *et seq.*
 Shaftesbury, a plotter against Dr. Plunket, 448.
 Simony of Ussher and other Bishops, 77.
 Sinnot, Col. David, 337-8.
 Slaughter at Swords and Clontarf, &c., 148.
 Smerwick, slaughter there, 25.
 Smith, Erasmus, his Schools, 520.
 St. Leger, President of Munster, 155.
 St. John (Viscount Grandison), 52, 99.
 St. Ruth, General, 489.
 St. Vincent de Paul—His missionaries in Limerick, 394—(See note also), *et seq.*
 Stafford, his treason, 338.
 Standard Newspaper, 225, note.
 Staples, Bishop of Meath, 3, 91.
 Star Chamber, The, 37, (note) 38.
 Stewart, Sir W. and Sir R., 130.
 Stuarts—Their Protestantism, 471.
 Supreme Council, Seal of, 168, 178.
 Supreme Council (Ormondites), 283.
 Supremacy, Oath of, 41, (note).
 Swanly, Captain, 224.
 Swordsmen, Departure of, for Spain, 406.
 Sydney—His tour—His butcheries, 12.
 Taaffe at Knocknanuss, 269 (note), 275—280—336—399—400.
 Talbot, Duke of Tirconnell, 460, *et seq.*—Lady Morgan on Tyrconnell, 461.
 Tanderagee, 250.
 Tara, Palesman's answer from, 144.
 Thurles, Lord, 72. See Ormonde, Duke of.
 Tichborne, Sir H., 137—197.
 Toleration, Complaints of, 97, *et seq.*
 Tories, 419 (see note), 420.
 Townshend, Col., 343-4.
 Trevor, Col. Mark, 426.
 Trim, Remonstrance of Grievance there, 82 (note), 103—180—185.
 Trinity College, its lands in Ulster, 43.
 Trust, Commissioners of, 371.
 Tuam, Archbishop of, 229.
 Tyrone and Tyrconnell, 36 (See O'Neill, H.)
 Ulster, Plantation of, 41, *et seq.*, 101.
 Ussher, Archbishop, 53, 74, 80.
 Venables, Col., 363.
 Vittoria Siri, 230 (note), 233.
 Waller, Sir Hardress, 325.
 Wallop, Sir H., 29.

- Walsh, Archbishop, 290-1—note.
War of 1641, 96-108.
Wards, Court of, 57, *et seq.*
Warner, Rev. F. (historian), 123.
Waterford, 344, 357.
Webster, Rev. Geo., Chancellor of Cork—His correspondence with Messrs. Dallas and Eade of the Irish Church Missions, 535, *et seq.*—Investigation by Dr. Whately, 545—Mr. Eade denies that there was an investigation, 546—Rev. Mr. Webster's eight charges, 546-7-8-9.
Wentworth, 43, 82, *et seq.*, 100.
Wexford, Cromwell appears before it, 336.
Whately, Most Rev. Dr., 529, *et seq.*—His dependence on the reading of the Bible to convert the Irish, examined, 530—His comparison between the conversion of an Oxford Divine and an Irish peasant, 531—See also Appendix III.
Willoughby, Capt., 175.
Wood, Thomas, at Drogheda—His dreadful narrative, 332.
Woollen Manufacture destroyed, 500.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.

- His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, Bishop's House, Westminster.
- The Most Noble the Marquis of Ripon, Carlton Gardens, London.
- His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Dublin, 4 Rutland Square, Dublin, 10 copies.
- The Right Rev. Dr. O'Reilly, Bishop of Liverpool, St. Edmund's College, Liverpool.
- The Rt. Rev. Robert Cornthwaite, Bishop of Leeds, Bishop's House, Leeds.
- The Right Rev. Edward G. Bagshaw, Bishop of Nottingham, St. Barnabas's Cathedral, Nottingham.
- Right Rev. N. Donnelly, Bishop of Canea, Rathgar Road, Dublin.
- Browne, Very Rev. Robert, D.D., President, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, 4 copies.
- Behan, Rev. John, Clondalkin.
- Byrne, Very Rev. P., C.M., St. Patrick's Training College, Drumcondra.
- Byrne, Rev. Thomas, C.C., Clondalkin.
- Burke, Rev. Sylvester, C.C., Donnybrook.
- Burke, Rev. Michael V., River House, Wrexham, Norwich.
- Cuffe, Very Rev. Michael, Endymion Road, Brixton Rise, London, 2 copies.
- Clery, Rev. Edward J., Chichester.
- Cleary, Rev. W., C.C., St. Mary's, Maynooth, 2 copies.
- Colgan, J., Esq., Messrs Jackson and Co., Hereford.
- Caffrey, Rev. Joseph, Anna Villa, Artane, Co. Dublin.
- Cullen, Michael, Esq., Greenfield, Maynooth.
- Clooney, Very Rev. S., P.P., Kilrush, Ferns, Co. Wexford.
- Duggan, Rev. W., C.C., Leixlip.
- Donovan, Very Rev. John, P.P., Celbridge, 5 copies.

Donnellan, Very Rev. Dean, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.
 Dillon, Very Rev. Canon W., P.P., V.F., Wicklow.
 Downing, Rev. D. M., C.C., Cathedral, Marlborough Street, 5 copies.
 Duffe, Very Rev. Patrick J., P.P., Donabate.

Fortune, Very Rev. W., President, All Hallows' College, Dublin.
 French College, Blackrock, Dublin.
 Flanagan, Very Rev. Canon J., P.P., St. Margaret's, Co. Dublin,
 2 copies.
 Fricker, Very Rev. Canon, M.A., P.P., Rathmines.
 Fennelly, Rev. John, C.C., Kingstown.

Gargan, Very Rev. Denis, D.D., Vice-President, St. Patrick's College,
 Maynooth, 2 copies.
 Geoghegan, Very Rev. Canon T., V.G., P.P., Kilcock.
 Gilmartin, Rev. Thomas, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.
 Grew, Very Rev. Patrick, S.M., President, St. Mary's College, Dun-
 dalk.
 Golden, Rev. John, St. George's Cathedral, Westminster Bridge-road,
 London.

Horan, Very Rev. Edward, P.P., Grangegeith, Slane.
 Hunt, Very Rev. James J., P.P., Saggard.

Irwin, Very Rev. Archdeacon, Castleisland, Co. Kerry.
 Ivers, Rev. M., C.C., 83 Aughrim Street, Dublin.

Kennedy, Right Rev. Mgr., V.G., &c., James's Street, Dublin.
 Kelly, Thomas A., Esq., 89 Lower Gardiner Street, Dublin.
 Keogh, Very Rev. Canon, P.P., V.F., Balbriggan.

Lee, Right Rev. Mgr. Dean, V.G., &c., Bray, 2 copies.
 Larkin, Mr. Christopher, Lowtherstown, Balbriggan.
 Leahy, Very Rev. Canon J., P.P., Sandyford.

M'Namara, Very Rev. T., C.M., President, Irish College, Paris.
 M'Manus, Very Rev. Canon M., P.P., St. Catherine's, Meath Street,
 Dublin.

Martin, Rev. J. A., C.C., 48 Westland Row, Dublin, 2 copies.
 M'Carthy, Very Rev. F., P.P., Ballyheigue.
 M'Mahon, Very Rev. M., P.P., Boherbee, Co. Cork.
 Molony, Very Rev. M., P.P., Barindarrig, Wicklow.

M'Carte, James, Esq., 20 Sampson Street, Everton, Liverpool.

Maguire, Rev. Edward H., St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

Murphy, Very Rev. Peter, Tomgraney, Co. Clare.

M'Donald, Rev. Walter, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

Maher, Rev. C., C.C., Cathedral, Marlborough Street.

Mannion, Rev. P., C.C., The Presbytery, Elphin.

O'Rorke, Very Rev. Archdeacon, P.P., &c., Collooney.

O'Hanlon, Very Rev. Canon J., Star of the Sea, Dublin.

O'Reilly, Very Rev. John, P.P., Rolestown, Kilsallaghan.

O'Donnell, Very Rev. P., D.D., Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

O'Dea, Rev. Thomas, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

O'Flaherty, Very Rev. J., P.P., Legland, Newtown-Stewart.

O'Rourke, Mr. Denis, Mount Allen, Keadue, Carrick-on-Shannon.

O'Donnell, Very Rev. Canon Thomas, P.P., St. Laurence O'Toole's, North Strand.

Prendergast, John P., Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Strand Road, Sandymount.

Phelan, Very Rev. Thomas, P.P., Borrisokane.

Prendergast, Rev. J., C.C., Urlingford, Co. Kilkenny.

Power, Rev. T., C.S.S.R., St. Mary's, Clapham, London, S.W.

Rowan, Very Rev. Edward, P.P., Vallemount, Blessington, 2 copies.

Ryan, Rev. F.M., Monkstown, Co. Dublin.

St. Vincent's College, Castleknock, Dublin.